

ΑΝΑΛΕΚΤΑ ΒΛΑΤΑΔΩΝ

35

JOHN LAWRENCE BOOJAMRA, PH.D.

CHURCH REFORM
IN THE LATE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

A STUDY FOR THE PATRIARCHATE
OF ATHANASIOS OF CONSTANTINOPLE



ΠΑΤΡΙΑΡΧΙΚΟΝ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΠΑΤΕΡΙΚΩΝ ΜΕΛΕΤΩΝ
ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ

1982

ANALECTA VLATADON

EDITED BY
PANAYOTIS C. CHRISTOU

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Boojamra, John Lawrence.

Church Reform in the late Byzantine Empire.

Bibliography: p. 223-234.

Includes index.

1. Athanasios I, Patriarch of Constantinople, ca. 1230 - ca 1323. 2. Patriarchs and patriarchate - Biography: 3. Byzantine Empire - Church history. I. Title.

BX395. A77B66 1980 281.9'092'4 [B]

ISBN 0 - 916586 - 76 - 6

80 - 12538

Published

by the *PATRIARCHAL INSTITUTE FOR PATRISTIC
STUDIES*

Thessaloniki, Greece

*Copyright: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies
Thessaloniki 1983*

*For Stellie Ann, Dean, and Nikki, who have
patiently awaited my return from the
fourteenth century.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	
Chapter I	
THIRTEENTH CENTURY BYZANTIUM AND THE NEED FOR CHURCH REFORM	11
Political and Ecclesiastical Affairs	13
The Nature of Athanasios' Reforms	20
Chapter II	
SOURCES	29
Narrative	29
Hagiographical	31
Epistolary	33
Chapter III	
THE PATRIARCHATES OF ATHANASIOS	39
The Life of Athanasios before the First Patriarchate	39
Athanasios' First Patriarchate	43
Athanasios' First Resignation	50
John XII Cosmas	55
Athanasios' Second Patriarchate	56
Political Ecclesiology	62
Social Reforms	70
The Neara	74
Andronicos Support and Athanasios' Reforms *	84
Athanasios' Second Resignation	87

* In the texte this title is different. Why

	Page
Chapter IV	
ATHANASIOS AND THE REFORM OF EPISCOPAL ABUSES	
	91
Ecclesiastical Dislocation	91
Episcopal Corruption	102
The Synodos Endemousa	105
Episcopal Residence	110
Conversions	112
Moral Life	119
Ecclesiastical Interference in Constantinople	123
Chapter V	
ATHANASIOS AND THE REFORM OF CLERICAL ABUSES	
	129
The Clergy of St. Sophia	129
General Instructions to the Clergy	134
Chapter VI	
ATHANASIOS AND THE ARSENITES: A CASE OF ECCLESIASTICAL DISORDER	
	139
Chapter VII	
ATHANASIOS AND THE REFORM OF MONASTIC ABUSES	
	149
Monastic Wealth	149
Patriarchal Jurisdiction	153
Protection of Monastic Property	154
Athanasios and Hesychasm	160
Monastic Decadence	162
Double Monasteries	165
Monastic Mobility	167
Mount Athos	170
Monastic Regulations	172

Chapter VIII

ATHANASIOS AND THE BYZANTINE REACTION TO NON-ORTHODOX RELIGIOUS PRESENCE	181
Jews, Armenians, and Muslims	205

Chapter IX

Conclusions	215
CONCLUSIONS	215
BIBLIOGRAPHY	223
INDEX	235

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with sincere appreciation that I acknowledge the kind and generous assistance of many friends and colleagues in the research for and preparation of this text. I am especially grateful to Dr. Nicholas Itsines who gave me unselfishly of his time and knowledge of the Greek language; to Fathers Stephen Plumlee and Basil Essey who read through this work in various stages of its preparation and made valuable suggestions on style and organization; to the Reverend Dr. Demetrios Constantelos who provided constant encouragement and inspiration through his own research on social thought in the Orthodox Church.

In addition, I would like to thank my friends at Brooklyn Tech for their encouragement and especially Victor Roth who gave me access to information otherwise unavailable to me. Dr. Alice - Mary Talbot was extremely generous in making available her manuscript of the edited version of one hundred of Athanasios' letters. Mr. Stephen Beskid of St. Vladimir's Seminary Library was invaluable in his ability to find the right book in the shortest possible time.

I would also like to thank Laurice Swaya and Victoria Fedoroff who typed the text and my friend and sister-in-law Pamela Liapakis who generously handled my photocopying. Finally, I would like to express my thanks to Professor Christou and the staff of the Patristics Institute for their interest and encouragement.

Brooklyn, New York
Transfiguration, 1979

John Lawrence Boojanra

Chapter I

THIRTEENTH CENTURY BYZANTIUM AND THE NEED FOR CHURCH REFORM

Political and Ecclesiastical Affairs

When the twenty-two year old Andronicos II (December 11, 1282 - May 24, 1328)¹ acceded to the throne of Byzantium, the empire was in a state of political, social, and ecclesiastical decline². In 1261 the empire had been restored to its capital, Constantinople, after fifty-seven years of Latin occupation. The city, however, had declined sadly from its former glory. The area of its effective hegemony was reduced to western Asia Minor, some islands in the Aegean Sea, Macedonia, the Morea, and Byzantine Thrace. Even this remnant was subject to continuing assaults of the Turks, the pillaging of the Catalan mercenaries turned hostile, and the economic exploitation of Genoese and Venetian merchants³.

The Byzantine Church was also in a state of moral and disciplinary decay, torn internally by the after-effects of the Union of Lyons (1274) and by persistent hostility between the followers of the deceased patriarchs Joseph and Arsenios. But in spite of the «disastrous reign» of Andronicos II⁴, the Church managed to pro-

1. AVERKIOS T. PAPADOPULOS, *Versuch einer Genealogie der Palaiologen, 1259 - 1453* (Munich: Neudruck der Ausgabe, 1938), 58. Andronicos had been co-emperor since 1272.

2. GEORGE OSTROGORSKY, *History of the Byzantine State* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1969), 466 - 498; OSTROGORSKY, «The Palaeologi», in *Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. J.M. HUSSEY (Cambridge: University Press, 1966), IV, Part I, 331 - 332. See also D.A. ZAKYTHINOS, *Crise monétaire et crise économique à Byzance du XIII^e au XV^e siècles* (Athens: Hellénism contemporain), 145, who refers to this period as «ce pathétique phénomène de la mort de Byzance»; LOUIE BRÉHIER, «Andronic», *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastique*, II (1914), 1786.

3. W. HEYD, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-âge*, I (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1959), 444, 483 - 484.

4. OSTROGORSKY, *History*, 479; DONALD M. NICOL, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261 - 1453* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972), 99. 114. Cf.

duce one of its most aggressively reform-minded patriarchs in its history. This book shall examine the nature and extent of the ecclesiastical reforms of Patriarch Athanasios, who twice headed the Orthodox Church (October 14, 1289 - October 16, 1293 and June 23, 1303 - September, 1309)⁵ during this turbulent period in Byzantine history.

Athanasios' voluminous correspondence is invaluable for understanding not only the ecclesiastical events of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century, but also the nature of Byzantine thinking on reform in a period of social decay⁶. In addition, his letters show the extent of his influence over many of Andronicos' secular and ecclesiastical policies⁷, his personal reactions to the

also A. ANDRÉADÈS, «Les Juifs et le Fisc dans l'Empire byzantine», *Mélanges Charles Diehl*, I (Paris: E. LEROUX, 1930), 9, note 12, who notes that Andronicos II gave panegyrista a difficult time. They praised him in two ways: (1) either they attributed the political successes of Michael VIII to him or (2) they pointed to his knowledge as a philosopher and scientist. Andronicos' reign has been reappraised by ANGELIKI LAIOU, *Constantinople and the Latins: The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972).

5. For details of the chronology of Athanasios' two patriarchates, see V. LAURENT, «La chronologie des patriarches de Constantinople au XIIIe siècle (1208 - 1309)» *Revue des Études byzantines*, XXVII (1969), 147, and V. LAURENT, Notes de chronologie et d'histoire byzantine de la fin du XIIIe siècle», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XXVII (1969), 209 - 234. The dates of August 23, 1304 - September, 1310, usually given for Athanasios' second patriarchate originate with Possine's misinterpretation of Maimakterion in PACHYMERES (II, 383) as August instead of June; see PETER POSSINE, «Chronologia», appended to PACHYMERES, *De Andronico Palaeologo*, ed. I. BEKKER (Bonn, 1835), 835 - 870. For Pachymeres' chronological order of the Attic months, see GRUMEL, *Traité d'Études byzantines. I: La Chronologie* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958), 176 - 177. Cf. JOSEPH GILL, «Emperor Andronicus II and the Patriarch Athanasius I», *Byzantina*, II (1970), 16, who uses the 1304 - 1310 dates.

6. All references to Athanasios letters are taken from the cod. *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219 (= V). Where the letter has been edited and translated by ALICE - MARY TALBOT, *The Correspondence of Athanasius I, Patriarch of Constantinople* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Press, 1975), it will carry both the folio reference and the Talbot designation. The notation will also include the numbering used in V. LAURENT, *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, I, fasc. IV (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1971).

7. See N. BANESCU, «Le Patriarche Athanase Ier et Adronic II Paléologue: État religieux, politique et social de l'empire», *Académie Roumaine, Bulletin de la Section Historique*, XXIII (1942), 56.

decadence of the period, and his attempts to reverse the Church's decline⁸. Athanasios, like the prophets of the Old Testament and such great monastic leaders of earlier centuries as Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, and Theodore the Studite, was a man of action. He was far more dynamic and innovative than the emperor Andronicos, his partner in the symbiotic Church-State partnership.

The ecclesiastical turmoil which Andronicos faced resulted from the high-handed manner in which his father, Michael VIII, dealt with the Church. Michael VIII's successes, whether domestic or diplomatic, were purchased at a price at once financial, ecclesiastical, and political. His efforts at ecclesiastical union, culminating in the Council of Lyons of 1274, produced not only great opposition among the people, but an antiunionist schism within the Church. He brutally usurped imperial power by the blinding of young John IV, scion to the Lascarid throne; the subsequent political schism had strong ecclesiastical overtones and would haunt Andronicos in the form of the Arsenite party and the pro-Lascarid dissidents in Asia Minor⁹. The emperor Michael VIII died on December 11, 1282, and although, during his father's lifetime, Andronicos had embraced the hated Union of Lyons and had taken an oath of obedience to the pope, the death of his father, ended his sense of obligation. The Union had so agitated the internal political and ecclesiastical life of the empire that Andronicos' first official act was to end it and restore Orthodoxy¹⁰. Wanting to please

8. Ibid, 28.

9. DENO GEANAKOPOLOS, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959) is an invaluable work covering the reign of Michael VIII and his political activities. For other facets of the political situation, see NICOL, *op. cit.*, 18; OSTROGORSKY, «Palaeologi», 332; GEORGE FINLAY, *A History of Greece*, III (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1877), 372. Finlay writes that the reign of Michael VIII shows what an absolute emperor can do to ruin a nation. Cf. C. CHAPMAN, *Michel Paléologue, Restaurateur de l'Empire byzantin* (Paris: EUGÈNE FQUIÈR, 1962), 162, who is more favorable to Michael's efforts at saving the empire, which without him would have disappeared in the thirteenth century instead of the fifteenth.

10. GEORGE PACHYMERES, *De Andronico Palaeologo*, ed. I. BEKKER, (Bonn, 1835), II, 159. The Empire was not yet free of unionist pressure, particularly among large landholders who felt that Latin military aid could better protect their interests; cf. PACHYMERES, II, 323. For discussion, see. RODOLPHE GUILAND, «La correspondance inédite d'Athanase, Patriarche de Constantinople (1289 - 1293; 1304 - 1310)», in *Mélanges Charles Diehl*, I (Paris: E. LEROUX,

the opponents of the Union and to reestablish Orthodoxy, he agreed to deny his father a Christian funeral; Michael was buried in Thrace without any religious rites or ceremony, out of communion with the Church¹¹. Two weeks after Michael's death, the unionist patriarch John Beccos quietly retired from the patriarchal office¹².

The official restoration of Orthodoxy was, however, a mixed bag of liabilities and assets for Andronicos; instead of producing the ecclesiastical peace he had hoped for, it released the partisan energies of the dissident Arsenites to stir up Byzantine society and ecclesiastical life. The Arsenite party had come into existence when Michael VIII deposed the Patriarch Arsenius (1255 - 1259; 1260 - 1265) in favor of Joseph (1266 - 1275; 1282 - 1283). A group of Arsenios' supporters maintained that he had been illegally deposed, creating a schism between the so-called Arsenites and Josephites that continued until 1310.

The Arsenite party gradually developed from a religious faction into a party of dissent and opposition to both the Palaeologan house and the «official» Church. They persisted in their loyalty not only to the long-since dead patriarch Arsenios (+1273), but also to the Lascarid house which still had strong support in Asia Minor.

When the former patriarch Joseph, so hated by the Arsenites as a usurper, was returned to the ecumenical throne on the same December day that Beccos abdicated¹³, they demanded that Joseph be excommunicated, and proclaimed that under no conditions would they submit to his authority¹⁴. On March 23, 1283, when Joseph died, the Arsenites again hoped to control the succession

1930), 121 - 140. Reprinted in R. GUILLAND, *Études Byzantines* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1959); 53 - 79.

11. NICEPHORUS GREGORAS, *Byzantina Historia*, ed. L. SCHOPEN, (Bonn, 1829), I, 150 - 154. See also PACHYMERES, II, 107 - 108.

12. PACHYMERES, II, 103; see also for an outline of these events, NICOL, *op. cit.*, 103.

13. PACHYMERES, II, 18 - 19. Pachymeres liked Beccos and referred to him as a «figure of spiritual virtue». On Beccos after his deposition, see LAURENT «Les signataires du second synod des Blachernes», *Échos d'Orient*, XXVI (1927), 129 - 149, and LAURENT, «La date de la mort de Jean Beccos», *Échos d'Orient*, XXV (1926), 316 - 319.

14. PACHYMERES, II, 36; GREGORAS, I, 161 - 162.

to the patriarchal throne¹⁵. Andronicos seeking a compromise in a man outside the partisan politics of the Church, decided upon Gregory of Cyprus, a layman and a scholar, and carefully chose bishops free from all association with the hated Union of Lyons or the Arsenite quarrel to consecrate him on March 28.

Early in 1284 Andronicos in a special effort to win back the Arsenites called a meeting at Adramyttion on the northeast of Asia Minor¹⁶. After much fruitless discussion the Arsenites called for a miraculous intervention and devised a special «test of heaven». When it went against them, they agreed to recognize Gregory as patriarch, but soon changed their minds and rejected him. Gregory responded by anathematizing them. When the Arsenites returned to Constantinople, Andronicos made another effort to reconcile the more moderate faction to the Church; he allowed them to bring the body of Arsenios back to the city to a shrine at the monastery of St. Andrew. Going still further, he granted the same faction, under the leadership of the monk Hyakinthos, the use of the monastery of Mosele in Constantinople. It soon became a center of Arsenite propaganda as well as a center for political dissent, a move that Athanasios later violently condemned¹⁷. The Arsenites continued to work for the removal of Gregory of Cyprus, who eventually had a doctrinal falling-out with some of the leading theologians of the Byzantine Church, among them Theoleptos of Philadelphia

15. For a sympathetic appraisal of the place of Gregory of Cyprus in Byzantine ecclesiastical life, cf. ARISTEIDES PAPADAKIS, «Late Thirteenth Century Byzantine Theology and Gregory II of Cyprus», in *Byzantine Ecclesiastical Personalities* (Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Press, 1975), 57 - 72.

16. PACHYMERES, II, 59. See LAIOU, *op. cit.*, 17 - 20; the Arsenites were not strong in Constantinople, where the Palaeologi were regarded as the saviors of the city after the 1261 reoccupation. The pro-Lascarid faction was not, however, in every instance identical with the Arsenite, which had a varied complexion. Among the Lascarids, John III was particularly revered for his acts of charity and mercy; see DEMETRIOS T. CONSTANTELOS, «Emperor John Vatatzes' Social Concern: Basis for Canonization», *Kleronomia*, IV (1972), 92 - 104.

17. Although the text of this letter is not included in the *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219, it is preserved in Pachymere's account. See PACHYMERES, II, 169 - 173, where he refers to the three horrors which produced great harm to the Church, among which he lists the granting to Hyakinthos and his Arsenite partisans a meeting place in the city; see *Regestes*, 1553.

and John Chilas of Ephesus. Although the disagreement was due largely to a misunderstanding, Gregory resigned in June, 1289, and retired to the Monastery of Aristine, pathetically affirming that his only desire had been to unify the Church, but his efforts produced the opposite results ¹⁸.

Four months after Gregory resigned, Andronicos secured the election of the famous hermit, Athanasios. Athanasios' election was not to be the occasion for peace since the Arsenites still demanded to be allowed to name the patriarch, and Athanasios' rigorous sense of ecclesiastical and canonical good order permitted no sympathy to the intransigent Arsenites, or to anyone who would not conform to the discipline of canonical norms.

Andronicos' rejection of the Union of Lyons represented a reversal of imperial policy from a preoccupation with the threats of western powers to a concern for the empire's internal stability. In Laurent's understanding, this reorientation was a result of Andronicos' weak and superstitious personality and the influence of «obscurantist» monks. He cynically concludes that the monks, among whom he no doubt would include Athanasios, encouraged a Byzantine chauvinism in leading the people to believe that their religion and their rites were superior to others ¹⁹.

18. PACHYMERES, II, 131; Gregory claimed that his resignation was from the patriarchate but he continued to hold his episcopacy (τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην) which was from God; the same distinction between *ordo* and *jurisdictio*, will be made by Athanasios at his first resignation. Gregory died in March, 1290; see PACHYMERES, II, 152, and EDOUARD DE MURALT, *Essai de Chronographie byzantine (1057 - 1453)* (Paris: Librairie «orient» Édition, 1965), 679.

19. CHARLES DIEHL, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, trans. by GEORGE IVES (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1925), 157. All sympathy with Latin ideas became an occasion for the accusation of treason. Diehl carries this theme further and claims that this anti-Latinism was the «underlying cause» of the mid-fourteenth century hesychast controversy - a conclusion which hardly does justice to the dynamism of Orthodox Christianity in the light of studies of hesychasm by Father Meyendorff; see JOHN MEYENDORFF, *Introduction à l'Étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1959), and MEYENDORFF, «Les débuts de la controverse hésychaste», *Byzantion*, XXIII (1953), 87 - 120. On the opposition to the union from a Roman Catholic perspective, see V. LAURENT, «Un théologien unioniste de la fin du XIIIe siècle; le métropolitain d'Adrianople Theoctiste», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XI (1953), 187 - 196, and LAURENT, «Grégoire X et le projet d'une ligue antiturque», *Échos d'Orient*, XXXVII (1938), 272 - 273.

Whatever the personal and political pressures, however, maintaining Orthodoxy and restoring the empire became synonymous. One must understand this identification in order to understand Athanasios' call for rebuilding the Byzantine ecclesiastical and social order on the basis of Christian Orthodoxy. For Athanasios, Christian fervor was the only way to save the empire from decay. Religious fervor was a new and a strong element and must be taken into account in the period.

At the turn of the fourteenth century, the mixture of religion in every aspect of Byzantine life was persistent. Athanasios' letters illustrate the distinct increase in the religious character of court and ceremonial life. He wrote several letters, for instance, urging Andronicos and his family to participate in the numerous processions which the patriarch organized and in the celebrations of the feasts of the Theotokos²⁰. Giving most of his attention to liturgical occasions and ecclesiastical matters, Andronicos virtually ignored foreign and domestic affairs. One author comments that though the

Turks were advancing in Asia Minor, yet the pedant on the throne of the Caesars seems to regard their intrusion as of less moment to the empire than that of the *filioque* clause to the Creed²¹.

Another author mentions that «public life in Byzantium increasingly showed theocratic trends»²². Andronicos seems to have decided to seek support for his reign in one party in the empire — the Church — and followed through with the logic of that decision.

20. See for example, V = 37v - 38r (TALBOT, 56; *Regestes*, 1641); V = 30v (TALBOT, 45; *Regestes*, 1655).

21. WILLIAM MILLER, *The Latins in the Levant* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1964), 179. Miller carries his hostility beyond what the sources allow when he claims that Andronicos allowed the fleet to rot in order that he might get money for the churches. Although Andronicos made gifts to the churches, they were in no way extravagant — some vestments and liturgical utensils were the limit. Cf. for instance, V = 44v - 46r (TALBOT, 66; *Regestes*, 1709). The actual benefits to the Church took the form of privileges and exemptions.

22. OSTROGORSKY, «Palaeologi», 344. On the waning of imperial prestige after Andronicos II, see IHOR ŠEVČENKO, «Society and Intellectual Life in the Fourteenth Century», *XIVe Congrès international d'études byzantines* (Bucarest: Éditions de l'Académie de la République Socialiste Roumaine, 1971), 19.

During the first half of Andronicos' reign, the Church, though divided by schism and the bitterness surrounding the Union of Lyons, dominated the internal affairs of the empire, partially as a result of churchmen's reaction to the blatant caesaropapism of Michael VIII's unionist policy: «All parties in the Church were determined that no emperor should ever be allowed to go so far»²³. Perhaps if Andronicos had been a stronger personality, less pious or less anxious about the legitimacy of his house, he might have taken a firmer stand with the Church and prevented its concerns from dominating his time and generating disturbances. His devotion to the Church was so extreme that Pachymeres, the leading historian for the period, reports, with displeasure, that on one occasion a bishop had advised the emperor that he could well overrule a patriarchal decision if he so wished. Andronicos replied that no emperor had such a right²⁴. With an emperor of such inclinations on the throne, the process of ecclesiastical aggrandisement was quite naturally accelerated. Athanasios was certainly one of those churchmen, in the tradition of the patriarchs Polyuctos and Michael Cerularios, who considered the Church so central to the affairs of society that he sought the expansion of ecclesiastical influence.

The Nature of Athanasios' Reforms

With the decentralization of what had been the brilliant Byzantine administrative system and the separatism accentuated by *pronoia* grants, the Church attempted to maintain in principle a strong ecclesiastical structure, with the patriarch having increased immediate control over ecclesiastical institutions. Athanasios tried to centralize the patriarchate even further by his program of ecclesiastical reform on the basis of canonical order and the freedom of the Church; this effort was perhaps most evident in his insistence on episcopal residence, especially in those territories not under imperial control. In his mind, the bishops were a source of unity to the faithful Orthodox, many of whom through political and military events found themselves under Latin domination in Greece and Crete, and under Turkish domination in Anatolia,

23. NICOL, *op. cit.*, 106.

24. PACHYMERES, II, 159.

and represented the possibility of Byzantine irrendentism by providing a focal point for local opposition to foreign elements.

Paralleling the general growth in the authority of the Church was a corresponding growth of monastic influence. Since the eighth century, an ascetic-monastic party, many of whose members served the Church as patriarchs, had dominated ecclesiastical life; ²⁵ the resignation of Gregory of Cyprus and the accession of Athanasios enhanced the influence of this party ²⁶.

Athanasios' two patriarchates are models of the new power and authority acquired by the Church, as well as the growing predominance of monks within the Church. In the mid-fourteenth century the persons of the Hesychast patriarchs Callistos and Philotheos further accelerated the growth of monastic power, often enabling the Church to pursue a policy different from the emperor's ²⁷.

Athanasios was at the watershed of the new power then moving into the hands of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

The leading contemporary historians, George Pachymeres and Nicephoros Gregoras, and Athanasios' letters affirm the harsh and extremely ascetic nature of Athanasios' personality as an ecclesiastical and social reformer. Although Gregoras is more generous than Pachymeres, both present Athanasios' monastic nature

25. LOUIS BRÉHIER, *Le monde byzantin, II: Les institutions de l'empire byzantine* (Paris: Éditions ALBIN MICHEL, 1970), 385. From 705 to 1204, the Patriarchate was occupied by 45 monks, 15 secular clergy, six or seven laymen, and eight bishops transferred from other sees.

26. For instance in 1312 Andronicos transferred the jurisdiction of all monasteries on Mt. Athos from imperial control to that of the Patriarchate of Constantinople; P. MEYER, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athoskloster* (Leipzig, 1894), 190 - 194. The full significance of this monastic domination was realized in the monastic victory of the hesychast controversy in 1347; see JOHN MEYENDORFF, «Society and Culture in the Fourteenth Century Religious Problems», *XIVe Congrès international d'études byzantines* (Bucarest: Éditions de l'Académie de la République Socialiste Roumaine, 1971), 51.

27. JOHN MEYENDORFF, «Spiritual Trends in Byzantium in the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries», *Art et Société à Byzance sous les Paléologues* (Venice: Bibliothèque de l'Institut hellénique d'études byzantines et post-byzantines de Venise, 1971), 60. BRÉHIER, *Les institutions*, 388, writes that after the hesychast victory, there was a divorce between the concerns of the emperor for the salvation of the empire and the monks for the defence of the faith.

as the source of his harsh and rigorous administration of the Byzantine Church. Gregoras reports that from the very beginning Athanasios, filled with divine ardor and severity threw a somber light on the life of the bishops and the clergy of the city²⁸. Bănescu refers to Athanasios' personality as «dur et impitoyable».²⁹

Athanasios was not a pessimist making tiresome pious and moral exhortations, but a man who saw a threat to the Church and the empire. He notes in one letter: «Christianity is being destroyed in two ways, from without by enemies, and from within by excessive injustice and depravity»³⁰. His monastic vocation led him to believe himself to be the spiritual and moral guardian of Byzantine Christian society. The function of the monk from the perspective of social responsibility was always to work for the well-being of God's people. For the monk-patriarch Athanasios, the struggle consisted of rebuilding Byzantine society on the pattern of monastic ideals and the social mutuality of the cenobitic community³¹.

Recognizing a tension between the imperfect social and ecclesiastical order, on the one hand, and the possibility of a nearly perfect life based on the pattern of the monastic community, on the other hand, he wanted to rebuild the social system and the eccle-

28. GREGORAS, I. 180.

29. BANESCU, *op. cit.*, 28; The compassionate aspect of his personality has largely been overlooked by modern historians dealing with Athanasios.

30. V = 4V (TALBOT 6; *Regestes*, 1675) διπλῶς γὰρ φθείρεται τὰ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἔξωθεν, μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν, ἐνδοθεν δὲ ἀδικίας ὑπερβολῆ καὶ ἀκαθαρσίας. Athanasios often uses the terms «church» and «empire» interchangeably. In fact, this notion of the correspondence of church and state had the same implication for him as it did for Israel in the Old Testament. It is clearly inadequate to translate τῶν Χριστιανῶν as Christians or Christianity, but rather as the Christian polity, the mutual commonwealth of empire and Church.

31. ERNEST STEIN, «Introduction à l'histoire et aux institutions byzantines», *Traditio*, VII (1949 - 1954), 137, writes that Byzantine unlike Western monasticism did not recognize the need to act in human affairs. He largely dismisses Byzantine Christianity as an administrative organ of the state, excessively ritualistic, and largely unresponsive to the needs of actual life. HANS - GEORG BECK, *Theodoros Metochites, die Krise des byzantinischen Weltbildes im 14. Jahrhundert* (Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1952), 32; for a discussion of the social function of Byzantine monasticism, see also GEORGES FLOROVSKY, «The Social Problem in the Eastern Orthodox Church», in *Christianity and Culture*, II (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland, 1974) 131 - 142.

siastical structure so that they would reflect his conception of right order and worship in the Christian world. For example, his repeated references to the discrepancy between the baptismal oath and the failure of the clergy and the people to actualize it in life were an attempt to apply monastic principles to Byzantine society as a whole ³².

Athanasios' letters detail all of the horrors of the decline of the Orthodox commonwealth. He moans:

I hoped to be counted «among those who sleep in their tombs» before seeing these misfortunes which have befallen the Christian people, or second best to crawl into a dark hole underground these days... rather than to manage the affairs of the Church of Christ my God ³³.

For Athanasios, the solution to the problems was the return to Christian morality, the abandonment of which had led to the horrors of injustice, exploitation, corruption in the Church, and indirectly to the evils which God had sent by way of chastisement. The process of ecclesiastical and social disintegration which Athanasios described was, by the very nature of his logic, inevitable and without an act of repentance inexorable. In sound prophetic style he affirmed that «if we did not sow these troubles, we would not reap their fruit» ³⁴. With numbing repetition he called on Andronicos as the «pious ruler» to impose a return to Christian morality and repentance (ἐπιστροφή καὶ μετάνοια), the only virtues that could save the Church and empire ³⁵.

Following the theme of chastisement and repentance Athanasios quoted the Prophet Jeremiah:

32. V = 223v (*Regestes*, 1776); V = 205r (*Regestes*, 1660); PACHYMERES, II, 150.

33. V = 7v (TALBOT, 14; *Regestes*, 1677).

34. V = 8r (TALBOT, 14, *Regestes*, 1677): εἰ γὰρ μὴ ταῦτα ἐσπείραμεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐθελίζομεν. See also V = 8v (TALBOT, 15; *Regestes*, 1611).

35. V = 8v (TALBOT, 15; *Regestes*, 1611). For a discussion of «immanent justice», of which Athanasios' approach to the Byzantine military and social dilemma is one example, see CHARLES RADDING, «Superstition to Science: Nature, Fortune, and the Passing of the Medieval Ordeal», *The American Historical Review*, LXXXIV (October, 1979), 945 - 969, at 951 - 953; also ROUSSET, «La croyance en la justice immanente à l'époque féodale», *Le Moyen Âge*, LIV (1948), 241; and JEAN PIAGET, *The Moral Judgement of the Child*, translated by GABAIN (New York, 1948), 251 - 262.

And let it not be said about us, «O Lord, thou hast scourged them, but they have not grieved; thou hast punished them, but they would not receive correction». (Jeremiah 5: 3) ³⁶

The same letter used Jonah's warning, urging the Byzantines to reject the example of the Sodomites, who disregarded God's warnings and were both condemned and destroyed (Genesis 19), in favor of the example of the Ninevites, who showed repentance and were saved from impending doom (Jonah 3).

But simple repentance was not sufficient for this man of action. He wrote, paraphrasing James 2: 26: «Without acts, the faith is a dead body». He urged Andronicos not to «confound only by words the sins of the schismatics»³⁷ but to use the power given to him by God, for what good is a lion which has no «teeth and claws»³⁸. In another place he wrote, «Rouse yourself to provide justice for the wronged and punishment for sinners. Cleanse the Church from defilement . . . »³⁹ God, he assured the emperor, would assist the Byzantines if they would offer repentance; a perfect example would be for the emperor to force the bishops, who have betrayed God's Church and His people, to be obedient and return each to his proper diocese instead of staying in Constantinople and causing endless troubles⁴⁰. At the time of death «one need not show his words, but his deeds». He urged the emperor, «Do not shout down wickedness with words, but destroy it manfully with actions»⁴¹. Athanasios did not stop at pious exhortations and dire prophetic warnings of the punishment of God, but went on to make concrete suggestions as to how Andronicos should govern the Empire, defend the people, and bring about a moral regeneration in the Church⁴².

In addition Athanasios responded to this period of social crises by instituting a variety of welfare programs and a policy of

36. V = 3r (TALBOT 3; *Regestes*, 1673).

37. V = 4v (TALBOT, 6; *Regestes*, 1675).

38. V = 4v (TALBOT, 7; *Regestes*, 1597).

39. V = 4v (TALBOT, 6; *Regestes*, 1675): δικαίωσιν τῶν ἀδικουμένων, εἰς πείθεισιν τῶν ἀμάρτανόντων. κάθαρον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῶν ὑποκαμάτων.

40. V = 14r (TALBOT, 30; *Regestes*, 1598).

41. V = 5v (TALBOT, 7; *Regestes*, 1597).

42. For example, see V = 166v - 167v (TALBOT, 78; *Regestes*, 1638). Athanasios' concerns included military, economic, and social matters as well.

social restructuring. In the tradition of St. John Chrysostom, the fourth-century patriarch of Constantinople, he attacked all forms of moral corruption, especially among the wealthy and the ecclesiastical hierarchy; he sought to alleviate the oppression of the poor and in several instances called on the nobility of the city to house refugees and prisoners⁴³. The patriarch himself set up soup kitchens at key positions in the capital and distributed a gruel compounded of vegetables, oil, fish, and wheat to the poor⁴⁴. He set up a grain commission to reinstitute state controls over the provisioning of Constantinople and to do away with middlemen who he felt were growing rich speculating in victuals⁴⁵. Andronicos refers to Athanasios as possessing the moral virtues of John Chrysostom⁴⁶, and Athanasios in several places draws the parallel between himself and Chrysostom, his persecuted and exiled predecessor⁴⁷. In reforming the social and ecclesiastical order, Athanasios did indeed garner personal enemies and was denounced almost as often as he denounced others. Pachymeres' history records many attacks provoked by his rigorous asceticism and maximalist judgments⁴⁸.

Among Byzantines in the post-patristic age little attention was given to ethical or reform thinking; theological affirmations and clarifications prevailed, with theologians making no real effort to relate these creatively to the active life of the Orthodox people. Hans-Georg Beck has claimed that ethical thinking was largely foreign to this period, with the specific exceptions of Isidore Glabas of Thessalonica and Theoleptos of Philadelphia. Using the example of John Chrysostom as a paradigm, he writes:

Die christliche Unterweisung, Predigt und Katechese, blieben im Dogmatischen stecken, ohne diese Dogmen fruchtbar zu machen, noch dazu überwuchert von klassizistischer Rhetorik und antiken Reminiszenzen. Eine Homiletik mit den star-

43. V = 12r (TALBOT, 22; *Regestes*, 1684); V = 182r-185r; (*Regestes*, 1757).

44. V = 57r-58r; (TALBOT, 78; *Regestes*, 1638); also V = 166v-167v (*Regestes*, 1632).

45. V = 53r-53v; (TALBOT, 72; *Regestes*, 1649); V = 54r (TALBOT, 73; *Regestes*, 1642); V = 78v; (TALBOT, 100; *Regestes*, 1727).

46. GREGORAS, I, 246.

47. V = 2r (TALBOT, 2; *Regestes*, Appendix 2).

48. PACHYMERES, II, 55; also NICOL. *op. cit.*, 103.

ken ethischen Impulsen, wie wir sie etwa bei Joannes Chrysostomos finden, liegt dieser Epoche fern, ist ihr - mit geringen und kaum noch erforschten Ausnahmen - einfach fremd⁴⁹.

Unfortunately, Beck compounds his inadequate understanding of the period when he caricatures the monastic mentality and its prevalence as the reason for the lack of ethical consciousness. He makes the point that the Church, being in the hands of the monks, could not produce an aggressive ethical leadership, since by its nature the goal of this monastic ethos, contemplation (θεωρία), did not encourage practical teaching⁵⁰. This line of thought overlooks Athanasios, not only a recognized master of the monastic life, but perhaps one of the leading moralists and ethical thinkers of the Byzantine Church; his only limitation, apart from the universally recognized harshness of his personality, was the fact that he left no systematic presentation of his teaching. One of the objects of this work is to gather information from Athanasios' correspondence to illustrate that he was a mature, though unsystematic, ethical thinker with deep roots in both the Scriptures and the traditions of the Byzantine Church.

It is unfortunate that many historians dismiss Athanasios' reforming efforts precisely because they were motivated by an ascetic-rigorous tradition of Byzantine monasticism and as such were inappropriate to genuine situations of life. Even though his reforms were largely abortive efforts to redirect the empire, their

49. HANS - GEORG BECK, *op. cit.*, 39. Beck refers to such ethical thinking as *einfach fremd* in this period. On Isidore Glabas, see A. EHRHARD, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, V (Freiburg: Herder, 1930 - 1938), 625. On Theoleptos of Philadelphia, see S. SALAVILLE, «Deux documents inédit sur les dissensions religieuses Byzantines entre 1275 et 1310», *Revue des Études byzantines*, V (1947), 116 - 136; S. SALAVILLE, «La vie monastique grecque au debut du XIVe siècle», *Revue des Études byzantines*, II (1944), 119 - 125; and S. SALAVILLE, «Une lettre et un discours inédit de Theolepte de Philadelphie», *Revue des Études byzantines*, V (1947), 101 - 115; DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS, «Mysticism and Social Involvement in the Later Byzantine Church. Theoleptos of Philadelphia: A case Study», *Byzantine Studies/Études Byzantines*, VI (1979), 49 - 60.

50. BECK, *op. cit.*, 40; for a more sympathetic approach to the question of social thinking in the Byzantine Empire prior to this period, see DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1968), 88 - 110; idem, «Mysticism and Social Involvement», 58 - 60.

success or failure must not be the issue. Athanasios' efforts must be judged on the basis of his intentions, his keen insight into the problems afflicting the Byzantine Church and empire, and his influence on later ecclesiastical developments.

Chapter II

SOURCES

Narrative

Of the numerous reliable sources for both ecclesiastical and secular history of the Byzantine empire at the turn of the fourteenth century and of the life of patriarch Athanasios, the most important Byzantine narrative sources are the works of George Pachymeres and Nicephoros Gregoras. Pachymeres' *De Andronico Palaeologo* the best of the two histories, covers the years between 1256 and 1307¹. It is valuable because it focuses on the reigns of both Michael VIII and Andronicos II, during which Pachymeres was an ecclesiastical official and was in a first-hand position to judge and describe the events from 1289 to 1307². Gregoras' account, *Roman History*, written in the second part of the fourteenth century, benefits from the objectivity of time. But in spite of Gregoras' more distant perspective, Pachymeres' account is more accurate, more detailed, as well as more critical of the events and personalities of the time. This is particularly true of those affairs surrounding the two patriarchates of Athanasios; he disliked Athanasios and was particularly hostile to the patriarch's reform and disciplinary measures as well as to his relations with the patriarch of Alexandria, then a resident in Constantinople³. Pa-

1. ANGELIKI E. LAIOU, *op. cit.*, 345. See KARL KRUMBACHER, *Handbuch der Byzantinischen Literatur* (Berlin, 1897), 291 - 293. See on the importance of Pachymeres, V. LAURENT, «Le manuscrit de l'Histoire byzantine de Georges Pachymeres», *Byzantion*, V (1929 - 1930), 129 - 205 and V. LAURENT, «Deux nouveaux manuscrits de l'Histoire byzantine de Georges Pachymeres», *Byzantion*, XI (1936), 43 - 57. Also JEAN VERPEAUX, «Notes chronologiques sur les livres II et III du *Andronico Palaeologo* de Georges Pachymeres», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XXVII (1959), 168 - 173.

2. Pachymeres was δὲκκτιοφύλαξ and πρωτεύδικοζ. Cf. A. HEISENBERG, *Aus der Geschichte und Literatur der Palaiologenzeit* (Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1920), 26.

PACHYMERES, I, 313 and II, 148.

chymeres described Athanasios as being tougher than «beans which do not soften even in boiling water»⁴.

Both historians report extensively on the religious events of the period, especially in dogmatic disputes, and so have the appearance of religious commentators. For instance, Pachymeres quotes verbatim theological discussions and transcribes ecclesiastical documents such as those concerning the affairs of the Arsenite schism and the turmoil of Athanasios' two resignations. Neither historian was obsessed with ecclesiastical affairs or unbalanced in his perspective; their milieu was a thoroughly religious one in which the affairs of the Church were the affairs of society, and little distinction was made between religious and political issues - the union of 1274 and the Arsenite schism were of no less significance than the incursions of the Turks in the east.

Pachymeres' narrative ends in 1307, the year of his death⁵. For the remaining years of Athanasios' second patriarchate, investigators must rely on the *Roman History* of Nicephoros Gregoras, whom Krumbacher has called the greatest polymath of the last centuries of Byzantium⁶. Gregoras is, however, less an historian than Pachymeres and is used here cautiously only as a support for Pachymeres' more reliable treatment and for the period after 1307.

Gregoras, further removed in time from the events of the two patriarchates, was less hostile to Athanasios and even favored some of the patriarch's disciplinary measures against the monks and the bishops⁷. His attitude towards Athanasios was determined not so much by events as by a snobbery typical of a fourteenth century erudite thinker and cultural humanist. For instance, he attacks

4. PACHYMERES, II, 145 - 147.

5. LAIOU, *op. cit.*, 346. VASILIEV, *op. cit.*, 689, gives Pachymeres' dates as 1242 - 1310. For a more accurate dating, see PIA SCHMID, «Zur Chronologie von Pachymeres, Andronikos L. II - III», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LI (1958), 82 - 86, and JEAN VERPEAUX, *op. cit.* OSTROGORSKY, *History*, 418 - 419; GUILLAND, *op. cit.*, 65, take Pachymeres' account down to the outside date of 1308.

6. KARL KRUMBACHER, *op. cit.*, 4 - 7. Gregoras was one of the leading characters in the humanist renaissance of fourteenth - century Byzantium and had been a student, along with Gregory Palamas, of Theodore Metochites.

7. GREGORAS, I, 182 - 184.

Athanasios for his almost total lack of formal learning⁸ and appears to admire Andronicos II primarily for his respect for letters. His court, Gregoras tells us, was a «school of all virtues» and a place where savants gathered⁹. Yet in spite of his condescending attitude towards Athanasios, Gregoras' treatment is, nevertheless, more favorable to him than that of Pachymeres.

Ramon Muntaner's *Catalan Chronicle*, although written sometime around 1325, describes at first hand events of the early fourteenth century¹⁰. The work is essentially a portrait, in the heroic style of the *Res Gestae*, of the Catalan leader Roger de Flor, but also provides much information on the condition of the Church and empire. Although Muntaner's view of the Byzantines is generally negative, describing them as liars and cheats, who are uncharitable in the extreme and arrogant, he is reliable on purely historical points of the emperor's dealings with the Catalan Grand Company.

Hagiographical

The two extant *vitae* of Athanasios, dating from the fourteenth century when the cult of his veneration flourished in the Orthodox Church, are the only sources for his life prior to 1289, the year he became patriarch. Most of the information is supported by the two narrative historians as well as Athanasios' own correspondence¹¹.

The most important of the two *vitae* from Talbot's view is the one preserved in several manuscripts and edited in its complete form in 1905 by Papadopoulos - Kerameus¹². The same *Vita* ap-

8. GREGORAS, I, 180.

9. GREGORAS, I, 327.

10. RAMON MUNTANER, *The Chronicle of Muntaner*, in 2 vols., translated by LADY GOODENOUGH (London: Hakluyt Society, 1921). On the value of Muntaner, see A. RUBIÓ Y LLUCH, *Paquimères y Muntaner* («Memories de la seccio historico-arqueològica del Institut d'Estudis Catalans», I (Barcelona, 1927), 15, where he writes that Pachymeres' description of Roger de Flor is more accurate than that of Muntaner. See N. IORGA, «Ramon Muntaner et l'empire byzantin», *Contributions catalanes à l'histoire byzantine* (Paris: J. GAMBER, 1927), 9 - 39.

11. F. HALKIN, «L'hagiographie byzantine au service de l'histoire», *XIII International Congress of Byzantine Studies* (Oxford: University Press, 1970), 352.

12. A. PAPADOPOULOS - KERAMEUS (ed.), «Žitija drux Vselerskix patriar-

peared in 1897, edited from a less complete manuscript by Hippolyte Delehaye¹³. Although anonymous in the chief manuscripts, the fifteenth century *Chalke* 64 ascribes it to the scholiast Theoktistos the Studite¹⁴. Whoever the author, textual evidence suggests he was a student and disciple of Athanasios. The manuscript *Chalke* 64, as Talbot notes, is devoted to perpetuating Athanasios' memory and contains, in addition to Theoktistos' *Vita*, an «Encomium on the Patriarch», an «Oration on the Translation of Athanasios' Relics», and two *akoulouthiai*. Neither the encomium nor the *akoulouthiai* contains any material of historical importance for our subject¹⁵, but the oration describes the growth of the cult of Athanasios, his burial, the translation of his relics, and the numerous miracles associated with him. The manuscript demonstrates the extent of the popular devotion which sprang up among both laymen and monastics in the course of the fourteenth century.

The second *Vita*, that of Joseph Kalothetos, a Hesychast monk

XOV XIVv., svv. Afanasija I i Isidora I», *Zapiski istoriko-filol. fakul'teta Imperatorskogo S. - Peterburgsko Universiteta*, LXXVI (1905), 1 - 51.

13. HIPPOLYTE DELEHAYE, (ed.), «La Vie d'Athanasie, Patriarche de Constantinople», *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire d'école française de Rome*, XVII (1897), 39-75. THEOKTISTOS, *Vita Athanasii* will be referred to from the Delehaye text as TVA with the appropriate page number. Delehaye made use of the manuscript *Gr. Baber*. 583 for the *Vita*; see «Catalogue Codicum Hagiographicorum Graecorum Bibliothecae Barberiniana de Urbe», *Analecta Bollandiana*, XIX (1900), 110.

14. *Cod. Constantinopol. Chalcenis mon. 64*, 107 - 133. (In the Library of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, Collection of Holy Trinity monastery on Chalke). On Theoktistos the Studite, cf. MEYENDORFF, *Introduction*, 34, note 34; also see ALBERT EHRHARD, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche*, Part I, III (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1952), 991.

15. In *Chalke* 64, the Encomium = 107r - 133r; the Oration on the Translation of the Relics = 157r - 199r. Both the Oration and the Encomium are assigned to Theoktistos. The two *akoulouthiai* (= 1r - 38v; 134r - 157v) are assigned to the monk Ignatios; on Ignatios, see EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, 991, note 2, and LAURENT, «La Direction spirituelle à Byzance: La correspondance d'Irene - Eulogie Choumnaina Paleologine avec son second directeur», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XIV (1956), 66, who identifies this Ignatios with the spiritual advisor of Irene Choumnos, succeeding Theoleptos of Philadelphia. Irene had directed a letter to her advisor asking him to send her a work he had written on Athanasios.

of the second half of the fourteenth century¹⁶, is substantially the same as Theoktistos'. But Kalothetos was not a disciple and, basing his account on second-hand material¹⁷, included almost no names, chronological references, or accounts of miracles.

In both cases, as might be expected, the panegyrists do not admit any possible justification for the hostility which had been directed against their subject. In spite of the hagiographical embellishment, the *vitae* supply hard information which is borne out by the letters of Athanasios. This agreement between the epistolary and hagiographical sources indicates that both were probably part of a larger quantity of literature available throughout the fourteenth century celebrating the philanthropic patriarch of Constantinople.

Epistolary

The most valuable source of information for this paper is Athanasios' own voluminous correspondence. Collected early in the fourteenth century purely as an act of piety, his letters and writings are an invaluable historical source, until recently largely unknown or ignored by scholars. They are, in fact, the least-tapped source for the social, ecclesiastical, and political events of the period; in addition, they represent an epistolary form which at this time in Byzantine history was a literary genre with its own rules. But the very informality of these letters, as Verpeaux points out, permits them to convey vast amounts of information¹⁸. In this sense they are exceptional in addition to letters directed to the emperor, the people, and secular and ecclesiastical officials, the collections include encyclicals and treatises, most often carrying no dates, validation, or even address.

16. ATHANASIOS PANTOKRATORINOS, ed. «Βίος καὶ πολιτεία Ἀθανασίου Α', οὐκουμηνικοῦ πατριάρχου συγγραφεῖς ὑπὸ Ἰωσήφ Καλοθέτου», *Θρακικὰ*, XIII (1940), 56 - 107. The *Vita Athanasii* of Joseph Kalothetos will be referred to below as KVA with the appropriate page number. On Joseph Kalothetos, see ΝΙΚΟΣ Α. ΒΕΕΣ, «Ἰωσήφ Καλοθέτης καὶ ἀναγραφή ἔργων αὐτοῦ», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XVII (1908), 86 - 91. ΛΑΙΟΥ, *op. cit.*, 361, seems to confuse the two *vitae* and writes that Papadopoulos - Kerameus produced the same *Vita* as Athanasios Pantokratorinos.

17. KVA, 85.

18. VERPEAUX, *Choumnos*, 72.

Athanasios' letters were well-known as early as the fourteenth century. Both Pachymeres and Gregoras speak of them, suggesting that they were characteristic of the patriarch's manner of administration. Pachymeres, for instance, writes that the patriarch intervened on behalf of the people and expressed «his thoughts in letters which he addressed to the emperor»¹⁹. Theoktistos in the *Vita* is more explicit, citing the letters of the patriarch as already existing in a collected form and available for inspirational reading by the people (καὶ μαρτυροῦσιν αἱ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν αὐτοῦ βίβλοι). He specifies two as catachetical and edifying and offers the *incipit* of each for identification²⁰. He assures his readers that reading these will reveal Athanasios' greatness.

Although manuscripts of Athanasios' letters have been known for centuries and selected letters have occasionally been published, the bulk of his writings remained largely out of reach until 1975. The manuscript which is by far the most complete and worthy of attention is the *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219, in 274 folios, dating from the first half of the fourteenth century. In addition, Laurent has completed the long-awaited fourth fascicle of *Lcs Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, relying heavily on the manuscript to complete the register for the period of Athanasios' patriarchates. With the publication of Alice-Mary Talbot's dissertation, *The Correspondence of Athanasius, Patriarch of CP (1289 - 1293; 1303 - 1309) with Andronicus II*, a large section of the correspondence became more readily available. Since she concerned herself primarily with Athanasios' letters to the emperor, she left his works addressed to ecclesiastical officials, lay agents, and the general populace untouched and unedited in the *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219. Talbot is correct in noting that while Athanasios' letters to the emperor contain much information of historical interest, the remaining two-thirds of the manuscript contains numerous moralizing sermons, pious exhortations, and repetitious canonical norms for monastics and clerics²¹. Nevertheless, the value of the letters depends largely

19. PACHYMERES, I, 461.

20. TVA, 40 - 41: δύο τῶν κατηγορήσεων ὡς ἐν στήματι μὲν ἐπιστολῶν συντεθεῖναι. One of the letters which Theoktistos cites as particularly inspirational is found in *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219, 188r - 190r. The second, however, with the *incipit* Δεῦπνον ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις does not appear in the *Vaticanus* collection.

21. TALBOT, *op. cit.*, VI.

on what is being sought. In fact, the remainder of *Vaticanus Graecus* contains much valuable information about Athanasios' personality, his reform efforts within the Church, his canonical prescriptions which amount to a monastic rule, and his charitable and philanthropic endeavors without which we would not be able to pursue the theme of reform at this stage of Byzantine history.

Although the materials in *Vaticanus Graecus* are undated, dates of many letters can be determined from internal and external evidence. Where it is possible to date a given document, I follow Laurent's chronology in the *Regestes*. I will, however, consider the letters primarily thematically and topically, and the chronology of a particular letter would never significantly alter my thesis. Perhaps the most interesting use in keeping with this study of Athanasios' canonical efforts at reform among the episcopal hierarchy is the tendentious collection made of some letters in sixteenth-century Europe. Theologians at the Council of Trent hotly debated the question of episcopal residence, the reformers making use of several of Athanasios' letters on the same subject. At the time of the Council, the Spanish Jesuit Francisco Torres (Turrianus) translated eight of Athanasios' letters on the subject of episcopal residence into Latin and placed them in an appendix to his book on the same subject²². Employed by the Cardinal of Salviati in Rome in 1540, he worked there with the cardinal's manuscript collection and may have known the *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219 since it bears the seal of the cardinal's library on folio 273v²³.

In the twentieth century, perhaps due to the publication of the *Vita* of Theoktistos in 1897 and 1905, Byzantine scholars have rediscovered the value of Athanasios' letters for a study of the em-

22. FRANCISCO TORRES, *De Residentia Pastorum jure divino scripto* (Florence, 1551), 70 - 90. On Torres, see I. ONATIBIA, «Torres», *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, XIV (1967), 206. The Latin text of these eight letters is also reprinted in J. P. MIGNÉ, *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca*, CXLII (1885), 513 - 528. From this period we can date the two partial manuscripts of his letters, the *Parisinus Graecus* 137 and the *Parisinus Suppl. Graecus* 516, both of which were probably connected with the debates of the Council since they contain a heavy proportion dealing with episcopal residence.

23. The seal reads: Io: Car. de Salviati. We may assume with TALBOT, *op. cit.*, XLII, that it was in Torres' capacity as papal theologian at the third stage of the Council of Trent that he caused *Parisinus Graecus* 137 and *Parisinus Suppl. Graecus* 516 to be abstracted from *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219.

pire and Church at the turn of the fourteenth century. Both Guiland²⁴ and Bănescu²⁵, for instance, have studied Athanasios' letters in manuscripts available to them and have published articles of an introductory nature on the patriarch. Early in the 1950's the text of a few of Athanasios' letters appeared from the *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219 and *Parisinus Suppl. Graecus* 516 in the work of the Metropolitan Gennadios of Heliopolis, who complained of the patriarch's difficult style, poor division of text, and run-on phrases²⁶, but did little in his transcription to correct any of the weaknesses he complained of. More recently Angeliki Laiou, in the appendices of a series of articles, has made available unedited texts of several of Athanasios' letters²⁷. Guiland remarked forty years ago:

à la difference, en effet, de bien des *Correspondances* d'auteurs byzantins, celle d'Athanase ne comprend pas de lettres banales, mais offre, au contraire, une riche moisson de renseignement de valeurs sur Athanase et surtout sur l'Église byzantine, à cette époque²⁸.

This is certainly true of most of Athanasios' letters and writings. This work shall try to demonstrate the importance of this material for the study of the Church and the empire in the fourteenth century, and especially for an understanding of the reform efforts of the period.

Except when his personality occasionally appears darker, Athanasios' correspondence confirms fully the portrait painted by his two contemporaries, Nicephoros Gregoras and George Pachymeres. In addition, the material reflects the depth of the social, political,

24. RODOLPHE GUILLAND, *op. cit.*, 121 - 140.

25. BANESCU, *op. cit.*

26. GENNADIOS OF HELIOPOLIS, «Πρώτη ἀπό τοῦ θρόνου ἀποχώρησις τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἀθανασίου Α'», *Orthodoxia*, XXVIII (1953), 145 - 150; GENNADIOS OF HELIOPOLIS, «Ἐπιστολιμαία διδασκαλία τοῦ οἰκουμ. πατριάρχου Ἀθανασίου Α' πρὸς τὸν αὐτοκ. Ἀνδρόνικον Β'», *Orthodoxia*, XXVII (1925), 173 - 179. See especially GENNADIUS OF HELIOPOLIS, *Ἱστορία τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριάρχου*, I (Athens, 1953), 364, 375 - 381, 392 - 393.

27. ANGELIKI LAIOU, *Constantinople*, 334 - 340; A. LAIOU, «A Byzantine Prince Latinized: Theodore Palaeologus, Marquis of Montferrat», *Byzantion*, XXXVIII (1968), 386 - 410; A. LAIOU, «The Provisioning of Constantinople during the Winter of 1306 - 1307», *Byzantion*, XXXVII (1967), 91 - 113.

28. GUILLAND, *op. cit.*, 125.

and ecclesiastical corruption which was afflicting the empire. It is both an unusual and happy conjunction of sources - narrative, hagiographical, epistolary - which permits us to compile an accurate picture of Byzantine social and ecclesiastical life from the perspective not of an aristocratic observer, but of a simple ascetic-monastic calling the people in his spiritual charge to repentance and reform on the basis of Christian purity and maximalism.

Chapter III

THE TWO PATRIARCHATES OF ATHANASIOS

Life of Athanasios before the Patriarchate

The account of Athanasios' life before coming to the Patriarchate in 1289 is drawn from the *vitae* of Theoktistos and Kalothetos. Although the date of Athanasios' birth is unknown, it has been estimated at somewhere between 1230 and 1240¹. He was born in Adrianople (not Androusa, as some writers have held) of pious parents, George and Euphrosyne, who named him Alexis at baptism². Kalothetos reports that although his parents were nobles, Athanasios was raised in a simple fashion and adds that Adrianople was a

1. TALBOT, *op. cit.*, XVI. Talbot reasons that Athanasios went to Athos at about the age of 13. Around 1275, when the Unionist persecution began, he had passed three years at the Monastery of Esphigmenou, made a trip to the Holy Land, visited Mt. Latros and Mt. Auxentios, as well as lived eighteen years at Galisios. She therefore concludes that Athanasios was about forty in the 1270's and born about 1235. He was then about 75 when he died sometime after 1310. See also RAYMOND JANIN, «Athanasie Ier», *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastique*, IV (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1925), 1380, who accepts a date c. 1230.

2. TVA, 47; KVA, 61, where Athanasios' birthplace is referred to as ἡ Ἀδριανουῖ (= Adrianople). PACHYMERES, II, 139, reports the same origin. The *Chronicon Maius* of the sixteenth century, formerly attributed to George Sphrantze, a fifteenth century historian, relates that Athanasios was born in Androusa in the Peloponnesos. It has been demonstrated that this reference is an interpolation of the Metropolitan Macarius Melissenos of Monembasia (c. 1570) who wished to press the privileges of the See of Monembasia back to the reign of Andronicos II. He referred to a false Chrysobull of 1301 of Andronicos II by which Androusa was raised to a bishopric under the Metropolitan of Monembasia out of respect for Athanasios. See FRANZ DÖLGER, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, IV (Berlin: Verlag C.H. BECK, 1960), 1460; also, STEPHEN BINON, «L'histoire et la légende de deux chrysobulles d'Andronic II en faveur de Monembasie», *Échos d'Orient*. XXXVII (1938), 274 - 311. See GUILLAND, *op. cit.*, 54, who accepts that Athanasios was born in Androusa.

city renowned for its philanthropy and the care of strangers and unwed mothers³.

Early in life Athanasios read the *Vita* of St. Alypios the Stylite and, following the example of the saint, left home and went to Thessalonica, where he changed his name, after the monastic fashion, to Acacios and entered the religious life under his uncle Philip. Shortly after, he moved on to Mt. Athos and lived there first as a hermit and then at the Monastery of Esphigmenou, where he served on tables and was loved by all. Kalothetos writes that after the death of his confessor⁴ he began a typically Eastern monastic tour of the Holy Land and the monasteries around the Jordan⁵. He traveled from there to Mt. Latros, and then on to Mt. St. Auxentios, where he met his distinguished older contemporaries Elias, Neilos the Italian, and Athanasios Lependrenos. Meyendorff discusses them as forerunners of Hesychasm⁶, and Athanasios' contact with them places his reform efforts in the larger context of the Hesychast movement.

Athanasios moved on to Galisios near Ephesus, where he settled at the Monastery of St. Lazaros at the request of the monks who had heard of his piety⁷. He lived there for eight years and changed his name a second time to Athanasios, achieving the rank of *μεγαλόσχημος*⁸. He was also ordained against his will to the diaconate and then to the priesthood, remaining in this state for about ten years⁹.

3. KVA, 61.

4. KVA, 69 - 71, note 1.

5. TVA, 44 - 50; KAV, 75 - 77.

6. TVA, 51; see MEYENDORFF, *Introduction*, 40.

7. KVA, 75.

8. As early as the seventh or eighth century, Byzantine monasticism developed the custom of a «second tonsure», accompanied by a second name change. It was offered only in cases where the monk had achieved an exceptional state of spiritual perfection and practised a severe form of asceticism. Gregory Palamas in the mid-fourteenth century, referring to the authority of St. Theodore the Studite, opposed this practice in a letter to the hieromonk Paul Asen. He advises Paul that he might wear the insignia of the *μεγαλόσχημος* but without undergoing any formal rite and without receiving any particular authority. For discussion of this, see MEYENDORFF, *Introduction*, 385, who refers to Gregory's letter in the cod. Sinait. gr. 1604, fol. 567.

9. TVA, 51 - 52. Although the text is unclear, the total number of years seems to be eighteen — ten as priest and eight as a simple monk — not eight as GUILLAND, *op. cit.*, 54, concludes.

In the library at Galisios he found numerous books of good quality, some of which he read three or four times¹⁰. Since it is unlikely that a monastic library would contain secular books, we can assume that his reading was limited to works of a spiritual and theological nature, such as synaxaria of saints lives, writings of such early fathers as Basil the Great, St. Gregory of Nazianzos, and canonical collections.

Certainly, the style of his letters is what would be expected of someone whose reading was limited to spiritual works. According to Kalothetos, Athanasios searched for books to read while he toured the Holy Land and the Jordan region¹¹. This interest in books and reading seems to qualify Gregoras' judgment on Athanasios' learning¹²; Athanasios was, however, aware of the limitations of his own literary abilities and wrote to that effect in at least two of his letters¹³. Theoktistos readily admits that Athanasios possessed little profane learning, but considers it no liability¹⁴. Among Athanasios' letters for example, is a curious one in which he returns a book sent to him as a gift, explaining to the donor that it was not of any interest to him or those about him¹⁵. Since he offered no explanation and made no allusion to the nature of the work, we cannot assume that it represents a rejection of learning as such.

While Athanasios was at Galisios, he is reported to have heard Christ's voice while in prayer: «Because you love me, you shall feed my chosen people». Theoktistos who adds that he heard the same thing at Mt. Ganos, takes this as a prophecy that Athanasios would have two tenures on the patriarchal throne¹⁶.

Athanasios returned to Athos at a time, as Theoktistos writes, when the Church was troubled by the «devil's seed» of a heresy which is described as τῶν πνευματομάχων Ἱταλῶν ἀἵρεσιν, obviously a reference to the Union of Lyons, the *filioque*, and the patriarch John Beccos' efforts to enforce it. Athanasios vigorously opposed

10. TVA, 52 - 53.

11. KVA, 71.

12. GREGORAS, I, 180.

13. V = 54v (TALBOT, 73; *Regestes* 1642); and V = 71v (TALBOT 86; *Regestes*, Appendix 6).

14. TVA, 65.

15. V = 11v (TALBOT, 20; *Regestes*, 1681).

16. TVA, 53; KVA, 78.

the heresy; the *vitae* place his opposition in the context of Michael VIII's persecution of the monks at Athos. Many monks fled the Holy Mountain, and Athanasios himself returned to Galisics where he described the «new heresy» (νεοφρονοῦς αἰρέσεως) to the monks¹⁷. He attracted the attention of the emperor Michael for this opposition and aroused his «tyrannical wrath»¹⁸.

From Galisios Athanasios went to Ganos in Thrace where he continued to preach against the *filioque* and against Beccos. While there, he was attacked by one of the unionist bishops whom Michael and Beccos were placing in episcopal sees and was sent to Constantinople to face the wrath of Michael VIII, who personally tried to convince him to change his way of thinking. Athanasios was physically beaten and forbidden to speak or teach against the Union. When the emperor eventually released him, he returned to Ganos and continued to work against the Union¹⁹. In spite of this, none of Athanasios' letters deal with the substance of the Union or with the *filioque*. In fact, they are silent on any theological question. They are, however, definitely anti-Latin and one of them actually attacks the clergy of St. Sophia for their earlier compliance with the Union²⁰.

In Pachymeres' narrative we first meet Athanasios on Ganos before he came to Constantinople and the Patriarchate²¹. When Athanasios was introduced to the new emperor Andronicos II is uncertain, but Andronicos was impressed with Athanasios' piety and installed him in the former monastery of the Grand Logaristes in the Xerolophos section of the city, where he often called on him for advice²².

17. TVA, 53.

18. TVA, 50 - 51; KVA, 80 - 81.

19. TVA, 51 - 52, 56 - 57; Athonite tradition has tended to exaggerate Michael's persecution of the Athonite monks; cf. P. MEYER, *Die Hauptkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster* (Leipzig, 1894), 53 - 54; also GERMAINE ROUILLARD, «La politique de Michel VIII Paléologue à l'égard des monastères», *Études byzantines*, I (1943), 73 - 84.

20. V = 208r - 208v (*Regestes*, 1764).

21. PACHYMERES, II, 107.

22. PACHYMERES, II, 108. This monastery may be identified with Athanasios' monastery at Xerolophos, since we know that he retired there after his 1293 resignation. See RAYMOND JANIN, *La Géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin*, III: *Les églises et les monastères* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1953), 14 - 15, 342 - 343.

After Gregory of Cyprus retired, Andronicos again sought a man for the throne who was separated from the partisan politics of the past several decades. Andronicos decided upon Athanasios who had lived most of his monastic life outside the capital and away from its conflicts. There is no indication, for instance, that Athanasios had any significant contact with the Arsenites until he came into the city²³. The emperor hoped that by selecting Athanasios he could gain the respect of the Arsenites for a Church led by an austere monk. Such, however, was not to be the case.

Athanasios' First Patriarchate

According to Byzantine canonical patterns, the synod proposed three candidates for the patriarchal office; Andronicos would select one. The three were Gennadios of Justiniana Prima, James, an abbot of an Athonite monastery, and Athanasios²⁴. Andronicos readily decided on Athanasios. Both *vitae* and Pachymeres agree that Athanasios was at first reluctant to accept the position in spite of the visions he was reported to have experienced earlier²⁵. The emperor and the synod eventually prevailed upon him to accept the patriarchate, as Theoktistos records, «with one voice, with one vote, with one mind, the hierarchs, the priests, holy men and men of virtue called Athanasios to the ecumenical throne»²⁶. This is no doubt an hagiographical overstatement, especially in the light of the events which quickly followed.

As soon as the news of Athanasios' selection spread about the city, rumors of his austere life and harsh personality spread and established the tone of Athanasios' two patriarchates. The turmoil was so great, in fact, that Andronicos was compelled to hold two public hearings at which witnesses testified for and against the patriarch-elect. Pachymeres eagerly reports the entire affair, adding that the nature of those people surrounding Athanasios confirmed this widespread sentiment that he was indeed austere, extremely

23. Athanasios' contacts with the Arsenite Athanasios Lependrinus, mentioned as one of his teachers, is an exception to this; see MEYENDORFF, *Introduction*, xlii.

24. PACHYMERES, II, 139; TVA, 62.

25. PACHYMERES, II, 139 - 140; TVA, 60, 62; KVA, 88 - 89.

26. TVA, 62.

harsh, and unsuited to govern the church ²⁷. The emperor, after hearing all the reports, accepted only those which were favorable to Athanasios, reasoning that if the good stories were true, then the evil reports were of necessity false ²⁸. He followed by forbidding all those opposed to Athanasios to speak against him and by encouraging those who supported him to spread their accounts throughout the capital.

Athanasios' consecration took place on October 14, 1289, in the Cathedral Church of St. Sophia ²⁹. Pachymeres, venting his hostility towards Athanasios, reports several evil omens, presaging the patriarch's early expulsion from the throne; he took, for example, the violent earthquake which followed the completion of the liturgical office as an indication that Athanasios would leave the ecumenical throne, if not soon, then at least before his death ³⁰.

The judgment of modern historians, though masked with a *pro forma* respect for his asceticism and personal discipline, has been equally unsympathetic, and they agree with Pachymeres and Gregoras that Athanasios had not learned in monastic solitude the art of governing men! Such a judgment is based on the traditional understanding of the politically sensitive role played by the patriarch of the capital and implies that his reform measures failed because he did not know how to adjust to the necessities of human frailty. This may be partially valid, but is far short of the understanding necessary to do justice to Athanasios as a reformer.

As patriarch, Athanasios changed nothing in his previous manner of life: «He wished to travel the roads on foot, to wear crude vestments, to put on sandals roughly made by himself, and to lead an existence of absolute simplicity» ³¹. He also refused to live exclusively in the patriarchal palace and chose for part of the time a

27. PACHYMERES, II, 142 - 144; Pachymeres comments that these men are known in the city by their pale, disfigured faces and gaunt bodies.

28. PACHYMERES, II, 144 - 145.

29. EDOUARD DE MURALT, *op. cit.*, 456; PACHYMERES, II, 146; GREGORAS, I, 181 - 182.

30. PACHYMERES, II, 146; Pachymeres reports that the same things occurred at the consecrations of the patriarchs Arsenios, Germanos, Joseph, John Beccos, and Gregory of Cyprus, all of whom left the throne before their deaths. Of course, in the case of Joseph, we know that he was returned to the throne in 1282 and died in his office.

31. PACHYMERES, II, 140.

cell at the Monastery of Chora, the dampness of which he humorously complained about on behalf of the resident monks³². Pachymeres admits that he is judging Athanasios not on the basis of the patriarch's personal rigors (οὐ διὰ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἐξῆγερτα), but on the criterion of the unhappiness of his people. Pachymeres, in a pastoral sermon on the gentle qualities of Christian leadership, asserts that the Savior and his disciples lived with mercy and love towards other men, but «Athanasios and his partisans held a language very different», punishing sinners with the greatest severity³³. Gregoras, though distant from the patriarch's rigors, nonetheless judged him as an ignoramus with dirty feet (no doubt due to walking about the city in old and worn sandals)³⁴. Nevertheless, Athanasios' contemporaries did not criticize his manner of living, but rather were concerned that he might force others to follow his severely ascetic life-style³⁵. Thus, when he attempted to use his mode of living as a pattern for social and ecclesiastical reform, he confirmed his opponents' worst fears.

Athanasios saw a return to the monastic ideal of mutuality as the only salvation for the Church and empire from the Arsenites, general mismanagement, and a lack of discipline at all levels of ecclesiastical life. Theoktistos writes that Athanasios «took the Church which had been put to laziness for a long time and lay fallow due to anarchy; he first, without rigor, tamed the morals of the people»³⁶. In addition to his efforts at moral and ecclesiastical reform, Athanasios eagerly tried to set the pattern for social justice and welfare. Every day, writes Kalothetos, he taught, educated,

32. V = 6V (TALBOT, II; *Regestes*, 1634). According to Gregoras, the patriarchal palace was yet a splendid edifice, constructed by the best architects. GREGORAS, I, 569. See RAYMOND JANIN, *Constantinople byzantine: développement urbain et répertoire topographique* (Paris: Institute français d'études byzantines, 1964), 180, and RAYMOND JANIN, «Le palais patriarchal de Constantinople», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XX (1962), 131 - 155.

33. PACHYMERES, II, 140, 146 - 152.

34. GREGORAS, I, 180 - 183.

35. PACHYMERES, II, 643 - 650; Pachymeres reports on the conflict between Athanasios and the clergy of St. Sophia, who complained that the patriarch wanted them to lead a monastic life.

36. TVA, 63: ἐξ ἀναρχίας πρώτον μὲν τὰ ἥθη τῶν ἀνθρώπων οὐ χλαπῶς ἐξήμερωσεν.

and protected the poor, the widows, and the orphans³⁷; he reintroduced laws on marriage and celibacy, and worked for justice³⁸. His letters offer a picture of social decay which, until their discovery, was known only through passing references in the narrative historians or from the detached observations of such aristocratic social observers as Nicephoros Choumnos and Nicholas Cabasilas. His letters demonstrate a sympathy for the common people which is conspicuously lacking in the other «social» commentaries of the period.

As soon as Athanasios became patriarch, he directly attacked everything in the Church which he regarded as contrary to Christian ethics, ecclesiastical norms, and good order. He was not, as Pachymeres points out, a man of patience or subtlety, and he began almost immediately his effort to expel bishops from Constantinople and oblige them to live in their own dioceses. In addition, he forced the clergy of St. Sophia to conform to canonical requirements for personal behavior and the fulfillment of prescribed liturgical function. He confined loose-footed monks, fond of roaming the streets of the city, to their monasteries.

From the beginning, Pachymeres reports, Athanasios was surrounded by a group of monks who «came from nobody knows where» and installed themselves around him. Sharing his concerns, these monks formed a type of inquisitional body and instituted a reign of terror over their brother monks who they decided were living contrary to the monastic vocation. Pachymeres is so angered by their activities that he compares them to a scorpion who leaves its hole and indiscriminately stings everyone.

This band of zealots reproached other monks for the money they spent, for the possession of new habits, for owning two or three tunics, for wearing crosses of gold or silver, for having two meals a day during Lent, and even those who were sick for having recourse to a doctor. But these were more than reproaches; these zealots actually assaulted wrong-doers, arrested others, and confined some in prisons with no prospect of a reprieve³⁹. Pachymeres tells of a monk Sabbas, who did nothing without the consent of the patriarch

37. KVA, 90: ἀμύνων ἀδικομένους ρυόμενος πτωχούς ἐκ χειρὸς στερεωτέρων, προστατεύων πενήτων, ἐπαρκῶν χήραις καὶ ὀρφανοῖς.

38. KVA, 94.

39. PACHYMERES, II, 148 - 149.

Athanasios and unofficially acted as his agent attacking all sorts of «imagined» evils. He withdrew revenues from certain monasteries, for instance, after visiting them and condemned their inmates for their «crimes», presumably a reference to their wealth. The officials of these houses, who in some cases were bishops who had been granted them as residences, were outraged by the loss of income as well as the implicit judgment on their manner of life ⁴⁰.

Athanasios, it seems, felt that the reordering of monastic life was the beginning of the reordering of society. In order to set the example of a practical Christianity, the Church had to reform itself in part by sacrificing its wealth to the needs of the larger community. Such a process was not popular among the ecclesiastics and monastics of Constantinople at a time when monastic wealth and landed holdings constituted a significant percentage of the total wealth of the empire. Pachymeres' negative attitude towards Athanasios may well reflect the reaction of those established ecclesiastical officials whose prerogatives were being threatened by patriarchal policies.

Removing provincial bishops to their respective sees was a primary concern for Athanasios, both for the peaceful operation of his patriarchate as well as the general health of the Church. Gregoras reports that «many bishops were forced to leave the capital» and were dispatched to their own cities and required to stay there. Each was obliged to lead his flock, «not simply to live in the capital and collect revenues from his see» ⁴¹. Gregoras overstates the success of this policy of enforced episcopal residence as does Pachymeres who concludes that success was so marked that in the process Athanasios actually dissolved the so-called permanent synod of Constantinople ⁴². Many bishops, as we shall see later, were not only in the city well into Athanasios' second patriarchate, but even attended regularly-held synods.

Gregoras places Athanasios' ecclesiastical reforms in another context, charging that the patriarch had specifically directed his reforming zeal against «learned clerics», whom he either forced to leave the city or assume a more modest style of life ⁴³. Although it

40. PACHYMERES, II, 148 - 149.

41. GREGORAS, I, 182; Gregoras approved of this effort.

42. PACHYMERES, I, 159; for discussion, see NICOL, *op. cit.*, 106 - 107.

43. GREGORAS, I, 181 - 182.

is difficult to determine who these clerics were, it is appropriate to raise the question of Athanasios' attitude towards secular learning and the role this attitude may have played in the nature of his reform program. This consideration is especially significant in the light of the renaissance in profane sciences then underway, and the patriarch's distaste for the two leading erudite men of the period, Nicephoros Choumnos and Theodore Metochites⁴⁴. However, contrary to Gregoras' judgment, nothing in Athanasios' letters indicates hostility to secular learning as such. It is safe to conclude simply that Athanasios' interest lay in the realm of ecclesiastical and social reforms, rather than in formal learning.

If we are to understand Athanasios' influence on the future of Byzantine Christianity and gain a fuller perspective of his reforms, we must see him in the context of the zealot monks who looked to him for direction and the general revival of rigorist monasticism which they represented. As on Mt. Ganos, Athanasios was surrounded in Constantinople by a group of his male and female disciples, whom he instructed in the spiritual life⁴⁵. From Pachymeres' and Gregoras' perspective the monks may well appear to be a band of self-righteous and maladjusted rabble; from that of the late Byzantine monastic revival, which came to fruition in the Hesychast victory of the 1340's, they represent a maximalist movement of moral and ecclesiastical purification. Athanasios not only initiated reform measure, but was also the focal point for a larger reform movement.

All his endeavors to restore an orderly life to the Church and the empire seemed to have possessed the tacit support of Andronikos, who may have either genuinely agreed with his measures or simply allowed him free reign. He was certainly convinced of Athanasios' holiness and in some sense was under his «spell», but in spite of his support, the patriarch's measures so displeased most of the

44. On the Palaeologan renaissance, see IHOR ŠEVČENKO, *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos* (Brussels: Éditions de Byzantion, 1962), 19; BASIL TATAKIS, *La Philosophie byzantine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1959), 228; see also RODOLPH GUILLAND, *Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras* (Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1926), 69; Guillard outlines the theological renaissance which paralleled that in the profane sciences.

45. See TVA, 59 - 61 where Athanasios' disciples are discussed.

ecclesiastical and secular officials that Pachymeres describes the resulting chaos as being comparable to the conditions at the time of creation as portrayed by Anaxagoras ⁴⁶. Gregoras is a bit more objective and blames both sides—Athanasios for his excessive strictness and the bishops and officials for their excessive negligence ⁴⁷.

Many of the aggrieved officials complained to Andronicos immediately on his return on June 28, 1293, from a three-year political and military tour in Asia Minor ⁴⁸.

Andronicos, unsympathetic to their position, accused them of being schismatics who wanted to break the unity of the Church and leave the communion of the patriarch; he promised to hold them culpable and treat them as rebels. Kalothetos writes that Andronicos «feared the coming of a schism in the Church of Christ and revealed what they were saying to the patriarch» ⁴⁹. Theoktistos writes that Andronicos informed Athanasios of the «mania and the rage of the people which cannot be borne any more» ⁵⁰. Athanasios, who has been painfully aware of Andronicos' absence and even complained later of a general lack of imperial support during those years ⁵¹, seems to have received Andronicos' full support at this point since, as Pachymeres records, the emperor refused to hear any more of these complaints. The dissidents then met with the patriarch and demanded an explanation for his conduct which they felt was tyrannical and foreign to the gentleness of the Church of Christ. Athanasios was intractable and offered no defense; like Andronicos, he considered the meeting a conspiracy among those who wanted to create a schism in the Church. It was a self-fulfilling expectation; the bishops broke communion with him because, they claimed, he had given them no satisfaction ⁵². Two of their number, Gennadios and Sylaiote, pleaded with the emperor to support the just demands of the offended bishops; if formerly, they had witnessed to Athanasios' virtue, they told the emperor, they

46. PACHYMERES, II, 148.

47. GREGORAS, I, 182.

48. PACHYMERES, I, 164 - 165.

49. KVA, 95.

50. TVA, 65: τὴν τοῦ λαοῦ μανίαν καὶ λύτταν, ὅση καὶ ὡς οὐ καθεκτή.

51. V = 87v (*Regestes*, Appendix 11). The letter was written late in 1309 as an apologia for Athanasios' two patriarchates.

52. PACHYMERES, II, 165 - 166 (*Regestes*, 1551).

now witnessed to his defects⁵³. Andronicos was moved by one factor greater than his respect and love for Athanasios: his fear of another prolonged and bitter schism, which had just become reality.

By the latter part of 1293, the opposition to the patriarch had poisoned the atmosphere with intrigues and conspiracies. Demonstrations of hostility began to be associated with political opposition to Andronicos. According to Pachymeres, Sabbas, the famous agent of Athanasios, reported to Andronicos that the emperor's brother Constantine was heading a plot to seize the Imperial Throne, gaining support by promising to depose the Patriarch Athanasios. When Sabbas' charges were validated, the emperor charged his brother, along with some of his leading supporters, with treason. That several high clergy were involved in the conspiracy⁵⁴ clearly indicates the unpopularity of Athanasios' regime and the extent to which some bishops had gone to rid the Church of it.

Athanasios' First Resignation

The opponents of the patriarch could not be appeased. Andronicos, for the safety of his own throne as well as the peace of the Church, was forced to seek Athanasios' resignation. Early in October, 1293, Athanasios informed Andronicos in a letter that he had accepted the responsibility of the patriarchate because of the confidence he had in God and in the emperor, that he had done his best to reorder the life of the Church, but could do nothing now to stop the vicious lies that were rampant. Although he thought it uncanonical (ἀκανόνιστον) to resign, he would trust the emperor's final decision, no doubt hoping that Andronicos would again sup-

53. PACHYMERES, II, 166 - 167. His enemies went so far as to hide themselves in the congregation at St. Sophia and yell out at the patriarch so as to give the impression that the people were opposed to him. The opposition was not limited to clergy alone and TVA, 64, reports that some of the senate and the people rose against him.

54. PACHYMERES, II, 154 - 162. It is interesting that this association of clergy with the conspiracy of Constantine is ignored in modern literature. Laurent points out that many clergy joined the Arsenites in opposition to Athanasios; see LAURENT, «Les grandes crises religieuses à Byzance. La fin fu schisme arsénite», *Académie Roumanie, Bulletin de la Section historique*, XXVI, part 2 (1945), 242.

port his reform policies⁵⁵. Such was not to be the case. Instead, guards arrived to conduct Athanasios safely to the Monastery of Cosmidion⁵⁶. On the following day, October 16, 1293, Athanasios addressed a formal resignation to Andronicos, seemingly accepting his fate⁵⁷. Since the letter which appears in Pachymeres is different from the one included in Athanasios' collected correspondence, «one must assume that the patriarch composed two different versions»⁵⁸. In addition, he concealed in the Church of St. Sophia a third letter justifying his manner of life and condemning his enemies⁵⁹.

Because the first letter of resignation bears a signature with an official seal, Pachymeres claims that Athanasios renounced the governance of an «unwilling people», but wished to retain the dignity and privileges of the episcopacy and the ecumenical throne⁶⁰. Laurent accepts this interpretation⁶¹. This distinction between

55. PACHYMERES, II, 173 - 174 (*Regestes*, 1554).

56. PACHYMERES, II, 169 (*Regestes*, 1555); the patriarch clearly feared for his safety.

57. PACHYMERES, II, 175 - 177 (*Register*, 1556). GREGORAS, I, 191. For discussion of date, see LAURENT, «La Chronologie», 147.

58. TALBOT, *op. cit.*, xx. Pachymeres preserves the text of one of the letters (*Regestes*, 1556) and not the other (*Regestes*, 1557). The text of the second letter is preserved in *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219, 84r - 85r; KVA, 96 - 97; and TVA, 67 - 69.

59. PACHYMERES, II, 169 - 173; Pachymeres points out that the vituperative tone of the hidden letter is very far from the «sweetness» of Christ. FINLAY, *op. cit.*, 379, in keeping with Pachymeres' judgment, writes that «Christian charity was not a virtue prevalent in the Greek Church at any time, and Athanasius has even less than other priests».

60. PACHYMERES, II, 175 - 176; Athanasios' desire to hold on to the episcopal dignity was ignored. I am indebted to Mr. John Erickson of the faculty of St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary for directing my attention to several canonical items dealing with the separation of *ordo* and *jurisdictio*, as in the resignations of Gregory of Cyprus and Athanasios. The practice was expressly forbidden by Canon 2 of the Photian Synod of 879 - 880 (RHALLÉS and POTLES, II, 707 - 708), which held that once a bishop had returned to his monastic state, he was no longer able to maintain either the dignity or the function of the episcopacy; see FRANCIS DVORNIK, *Le Schisme de Photius* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1950), 273 - 274. See also the first Canonical Letter of St. Cyril of Alexandria which prohibits the same distinction between office and jurisdiction (RHALLÉS and POTLES, V, 357 - 358).

61. *Regestes*, 1556, critique; see *Regestes*, 1554, critique, where Laurent points out that patriarchal protocol called for the omission of the signature on

ordo and *jurisdictio* is expressly excluded by Byzantine canon law, although some precedents do exist in the late Byzantine period. What was most likely the case, however, was that Athanasios, like Gregory of Cyprus before him, had desired to renounce the patriarchal authority but not the episcopal dignity. Pachymeres seems to have been unaware of the second letter, which is also dated October 16 and included in the *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219⁶². Athanasios seemingly judged his first letter of resignation insufficient and drew up a second one in which he complained angrily that Andronicos had not supported his efforts to control either schism or immorality in the Church and the city. He found that functionaries (no doubt a reference to both civil and ecclesiastical officials) lacked justice and zeal for the well-being of the Church and that they unjustly attacked his efforts, fighting him with «impious cries of slander and false accusations». Consequently, he imposed upon these people an «indissoluble excommunication from the life-giving Trinity, and the curse of anathema»⁶³.

Athanasios refused to admit any guilt and affirmed that he was resigning for purely functional reasons, which he defines as his inability to rule an «unwilling people»; to attempt to do otherwise would be contrary to the laws of the Church. He wrote: «I resign from being their shepherd, following the example of the man who said: «I bid farewell to an unrestrained clergy and a disobedient congregation' (Ps. 63 (64):4) . . .»⁶⁴. Thus, after approximately four years on the patriarchal throne, Athanasios left the office on October 16, 1293, and took up permanent residence at his monastery at Xerolophos⁶⁵.

In the period following his resignation, Athanasios did not remain idle. During the patriarchate of his successor, John XII Cosmas, his monastic retreat became the center of much activity. In a letter to Andronicos, he complained that his enemies continued to ridicule him because «I am always talking with the peo-

all letters to the emperor or the pope. The existence of the signature on the letter of resignation (1556) would seem therefore to support Pachymeres' judgment that Athanasios' was attempting to affirm his possession of the episcopacy of Constantinople.†

62. V = 84r (TALBOT, 111; *Regestes*, 1557); KVA, 96 - 97; TVA, 67 - 68.

63. V = 84v (TALBOT, 111; *Regestes*, 1557).

64. V = 85r (TALBOT, 111; *Regestes*, 1557).

65. PACHYMERES, II. 177 - 178.

ple»⁶⁶. Kalothetos also refers to Athanasios' receiving many visitors and students in his place of retirement⁶⁷. In addition, some curious events associated with Athanasios' first resignation again brought him to the center of controversy and kept him involved in Byzantine ecclesiastical life. The patriarch, it seems, was not prepared to accept so readily the fate determined by his enemies. In his apologia Athanasios outlined his patriarchate: he acted in all purity to repress all evils within the Church and within Byzantine society. Expressing bewilderment at the need for a patriarch to account for his actions to the very people who are condemned by their own crimes⁶⁸, he again affirmed that he did nothing culpable, «but if someone has unjustly calumniated me, although my administration was canonical, my doctrine Orthodox and my conversation irreproachable, then I cut them off from the Church and the Holy and Blessed Trinity»⁶⁹. In short, all who shared in bringing about his fall, even indirectly by concurrence, were excommunicated. Four years after his resignation two boys, searching for pigeon eggs in the heights of St. Sophia, discovered a pot containing the patriarch's document hidden on top of a column, signed and sealed. The letter was carried to the patriarch John XII Cosmas, who in turn carried it to Andronicos since in his judgment it involved the emperor personally⁷⁰. The leading men of the empire were under interdict, including the emperor.

Athanasios' scheme, if premeditated, seemed clear to those involved: he was plotting to regain his throne. As patriarch he had anathematized the emperor; since as a layman he could not absolve him, he would have to be reinstated in order to restore Andronicos. The emperor met with a group of bishops who concluded that the document was uncanonical and that Athanasios should be brought to judgment for such an act. Andronicos was, however, too scrupulous to accept so facile a solution. According to Pachy-

66. V = 2V (TALBOT, 2; *Regestes*, appendix 2): πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ τὸ ὄλωσ
τοῖς λαοῖς ὀμιλεῖν με

67. KVA, 95.

68. PACHYMERES, II, 171; he specifically refers to the immoralities of πορνεία, μοιχεία, ἀρρενομηνία which are among those he complains of over and over again in his letters.

69. PACHYMERES, II, 173.

70. PACHYMERES, II, 251 - 252.

meres, when a delegation was sent to Athanasios to uncover his purpose in the affair, Athanasios admitted writing the letter out of «pettiness» (μικροψυχίας), and informed them that he had loosed the bonds of anathema before his resignation and regretted the disturbance he had created:

But when I wanted to retire from the throne and to resign from all patriarchal responsibilities, . . . straightway I released all the weight of what was written from my soul and made it null and void . . . I banish from my soul all the letters which were the product of a mean spirit . . . and granted forgiveness to all those who had been subjected to the curse ⁷¹.

In Gregoras' words, the affair was ended and «dissolved like a scene in a play» ⁷². Things were not that simple, however, and a letter preserved in *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219 contradicts Gregoras' irenic assumption as well as Pachymeres' account. This letter, addressed to Andronicos, considers the question of the hidden anathemas. In this clarification, Athanasios made no reference to the emperor's being subject to the ban and dealt essentially with the bishops ⁷³. Nowhere did he repudiate the excommunications as in Pachymeres' account, but stood by his actions and attacked the emperor for failing to support the reforms: «Why didn't your majesty protect me when I was wronged, especially since you forced me to assume responsibility [for the Church] at a time of trial» ⁷⁴. Writing as if he were yet patriarch, Athanasios reiterated his perennial demand for the expulsion of the provincial bishops from Constantinople, many of whom, previously expelled from the city, had returned during his retirement. Since the threat of the hidden letter was not removed, Athanasios, from his retreat at Xerolophos, must have continued to influence ecclesiastical affairs by what might be characterized as a «negative presence».

71. PACHYMERES, II, 253.

72. GREGORAS, I, 191 - 193.

73. V = 2r (TALBOT, 2; *Regestes*, appendix 2). Most historians have dealt with the hidden letter as if it had been retracted; see for instance LAURENT, «Le serment de l'empereur Andronic II Paléologue au patriarche Athanase 1er, lors de sa seconde accession au trône oecuménique», *Revue des Etudes byzantines*, XXIII (1965), 125 - 126.

74. V = 2r (TALBOT, 2; *Regestes*, appendix 2).

John XII Cosmas

Andronicos did not find the peacemaker he had sought in Athanasios. Still searching for such a man, he had selected Cosmas of Sozopolis, well-known for his virtue and spirituality, to succeed Athanasios as patriarch John XII ⁷⁵. Although the Byzantine historians praise his gentle kindness ⁷⁶ and record that he succeeded in reuniting the members of the Church ⁷⁷, the peace was short-lived. Though he was a monk of a less fierce nature than his predecessor, he nonetheless came into conflict with Andronicos over a number of noteworthy canonical and social issues ⁷⁸. Instead of turning his mind to political and military matters, Andronicos had to hear the old refrains again. The bishops began to complain to the Emperor that John ignored canon law and traditional discipline in the affairs of the Church and that he tended to ignore the bishops and often overrode synodal decisions ⁷⁹. The secular clergy of St. Sophia complained that they were consistently passed over for advancement ⁸⁰.

John's downfall centers around the bishop Hilarion of Selimbria, who confidentially informed Andronicos of an unspecified scandal involving John. News of this accusation leaked out, and on July 5, 1302, John walked out of a synod meeting, fatefully vowing never to return unless Hilarion was punished. The next day he submitted a written resignation ⁸¹, which the emperor decided to accept since he was eager to replace John with Athanasios ⁸². John complicated the affair by renouncing his resignation

75. PACHYMERES, II, 182 - 184.

76. PACHYMERES, II, 182 - 183; GREGORAS, I, 201.

77. PACHYMERES, II, 186.

78. See for instance, Pachymeres, II, 197, on the synodal refusal to impose ecclesiastical censures on those who violate an oath of loyalty to the co-emperor Michael IX; PACHYMERES, II, 279 - 284, on John Cosmas' opposition to the marriage of Andronicos' six year old daughter, Simonis, to Stephan Uros II Milutin of Serbia; PACHYMERES II, 298, on John's opposition to the Arsenite general John Tarchaniotes.

79. PACHYMERES, II, 300 - 301.

80. PACHYMERES, II, 186 - 187.

81. PACHYMERES, II, 339 - 342.

82. PACHYMERES, II, 301: τὰ γὰρ τοῦ Ἀθανασίου κέντρα τὴν οὐλὴν ὑπέκνιξε· μηδὲ γὰρ ἔχειν ὅλως αὐτὸν εἰρηνεύειν καὶ τὰς ἀρὰς λύειν, ἅς οὕτως ἐμπερισκέπτως καθίστη καὶ φρικτῶς ἀφώριζε, μὴ τὸν θρόνον καὶ αὐθις ἀπολαβόντα . . .

and Andronicos called the bishops and monks together to discuss the validity of the retraction⁸³. The bishops were divided on the question. John's supporters, like Theoleptos of Philadelphia, refused to accept either the resignation or the oath regarding Hilarion since both were submitted in anger. The other bishops held that the resignation and the oath were valid and that to permit John to remain would allow a «perjurer» to hold the ecumenical throne⁸⁴. Pachymeres insists that Andronicos merely used this event as an occasion to rid himself of John and to restore Athanasios to the patriarchate⁸⁵. Athanasios would oblige the emperor, however, by providing the occasion for his own return before the case of John had been decided.

Athanasios' Second Patriarchate

Athanasios was not passive in all the maneuvering that led to his return to the ecumenical throne; in fact, Pachymeres implies that his return to ecclesiastical life was premeditated. On January 15, 1303, Athanasios sent one of his followers, the monk Menas Scoloces, to warn the emperor of a series of imminent disasters. Menas explained to Andronicos that he had met with Athanasios who had informed him that in three days earthquakes would strike the city as a result of God's wrath; the evils could only be avoided if public prayers were begun at midnight in the churches and monasteries of the capital and continued for three days. Andronicos superstitious by nature, believed Menas. Indeed, on that very evening a slight tremor struck the city, followed by a stronger one on January 17; although neither of them did any damage, they were sufficient to assure Andronicos of Athanasios' prophetic abilities and holiness⁸⁶. Nevertheless, Athanasios still had many enemies in Con-

83. PACHYMERES, II, 374.

84. PACHYMERES, II, 350 - 351.

85. PACHYMERES, II, 353.

86. PACHYMERES II, 359 - 362; see TALBOT, *op. cit.*, xxii, who writes as if Athanasios headed this conspiracy to bring about this return to the throne. This is not at all apparent. See V. LAURENT, «Le serment de l'empereur Andronic II Paleologue au patriarche Athanase 1er, lors de sa seconde accession au trone oecumenique (Septembre, 1303)», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XXIII (1965), 130. Laurent writes that it was Athanasios' control of affairs in Constantinople enabled him to win back his position. LAURENT, «Crises», 276, refers to the earthquake prediction as «a sort of swindling miracle».

stantinople, who would not readily be appeased; a way had to be found to convince them. The prophecy, like the many which Athanasios had previously sent to Andronicos, could have been ignored⁸⁷, but Andronicos was convinced and determined to use this prophecy as the occasion to restore Athanasios.

Why did Andronicos want to reestablish the man whose reforms had stirred up Byzantine ecclesiastical life for four years? There are several possible reasons: (1) the patriarch and Andronicos actually had no substantial or personal conflicts; (2) the emperor may have assumed that Athanasios had learned from the mistakes of his first patriarchate and modified his behavior; (3) the first patriarchate may not have been as harsh as Pachymeres has describe it; (4) Andronicos may have wanted the Church in the strong corrective hands of a reformer patriarch; (5) the emperor was haunted by the possibility that the excommunications in the «hidden» letter were yet valid; and (6) as Gregoras writes, Andronicos believed that the return of Athanasios would expand the geographical bounds of Byzantine rule through the holiness so effectively demonstrated by his prophecies⁸⁸.

Andronicos acted on the prophecy and, without revealing Athanasios as the source of the revelation, assembled the clerics and monks to ask for their opinion. Some were cynical: someone who predicts evil and divine wrath in evil days is not necessarily a prophet⁸⁹. The following day he assembled a larger group of people and clerics to extol the virtues of the yet unrevealed prophet. Andronicos led them from the gathering to the closed doors of Athanasios' monastery at Xerolophos⁹⁰. Pachymeres describes the dramatic scene as the doors of the monastery were opened and it became immediately apparent about whom Andronicos had been speaking. Of Athanasios' humble appearance Laurent comments

87. TVA, 66.

88. GREGORAS, II, 215; JOSEPH GILL, *op. cit.*, 20; Gill points out that Andronicos' superstitious and weak nature led him to see the need for Athanasios' strong and austere hand on the Church and the empire. Gill's treatment is brief, with little understanding of the issues.

89. PACHYMERES, II, 364; The TVA, 66 - 67, records that on receiving the prophecy from Menas, Andronicos looked upon Athanasios as having received a vote of confidence from God.

90. PACHYMERES, II, 367 - 368.

that «l'effet fut magique»⁹¹. With one voice, the narrative continues, Athanasios was urged to resume the patriarchal dignity. Enthusiasm had undercut all anxiety concerning his austere manner of life and former demands on the people of the city.

Pachymeres records that Athanasios spoke to the gathered clergy and people about his concern for the protection of the weak and those oppressed by wealthy and corrupt officials. The emperor responded, no doubt recognizing the popularity that Athanasios had enjoyed while in retirement, by commissioning him to hear complaints of injustice. Andronicos not only respected Athanasios and recognized his popularity as an advocate of justice, but also recognized that, after the Latin occupation, the corrupt administration of justice had occasioned much popular discontent⁹². Andronicos' attempt in 1296 to form a twelve-judge tribunal selected from ecclesiastics, senators, and leading citizens failed⁹³ and perhaps he thought that Athanasios might fill the vacuum at least temporarily. Athanasios would continue to play this quasi-judicial role throughout his second patriarchate, with several outstanding examples of involvement in secular affairs to his credit⁹⁴.

Andronicos' plans to return Athanasios to the throne were stymied when some bishops accepted and others rejected John XII Cosmas' resignation⁹⁵. In addition, John complicated matters by cleverly asking Andronicos if he recognized him as patriarch; Andronicos, in a moment of typical indecisiveness, answered in the affirmative and heard John promptly pronounce an excommunication on anyone who would try to restore Athanasios to the throne. The emperor's goals were no doubt clear to John, and he was not about to make the path of Athanasios' return an easy one. Andronicos now found himself under the threat of two patriarchal bans.

91. LAURENT, «Serment», 131.

92. PACHYMERES, II, 235 - 237; for discussion of this effort and its significance, see PAUL LEMERLE, «Le juge general des Grecs et la réform judiciaire d'Andronic III», in *Memorial Louis Petit*, «Archives de l'orient chretien, I», (Bucarest: Institut francais d'etudes byzantines, 1948), 294.

93. PACHYMERES, II, 237: «Little by little, like the vibrations of a musical cord, it [the tribunal] weakened and died». In 1329, Andronicos III attempted a similar judicial reform, see LEMERLE, *op. cit.*, 295 - 316.

94. PACHYMERES, II, 369 - 370.

95. PACHYMERES, II, 357 - 377.

Athanasios, for his part, wasted no time in using the commission granted him by Andronicos to hear cases of injustice and to regain popularity. From morning until night, Pachymeres reports, he was besieged by complaints of injustice ⁹⁶ — an ideal role for a reform-minded churchman. His great popularity improved his chances for regaining the patriarchate. In fact, some of his cynical opponents actually claimed that his concern for the oppressed was merely a sham designed to win him support for the throne ⁹⁷.

In addition to the opposition of John Cosmas' supporters, the clerics of Constantinople soon realized what another tenure for Athanasios would mean for them. The bishops and priests who had enthusiastically hailed him at Xerolophos began to have second thoughts as they recalled his harshness and the reasons for his first resignation. Pachymeres speaks of three different groups divided on the issue of Athanasios' return: one party favored his return to the leadership of the Church and the reform which that would bring; a second, a strange mixture of the Arsenites, the secular clergy of St. Sophia, the metropolitans led by Athanasios' archenemy, Athanasios II of Alexandria ⁹⁸, and the supporters of John Cosmas, absolutely opposed him and his treatment of the clergy; and a third group was willing to recognize him if he would change his manner of administering the Church ⁹⁹. When John Cosmas finally resigned on June 21, 1303, he revoked his excommunications, but affirmed that he did not approve of Athanasios' return to the ecumenical throne and that his 1293 resignation had been quite legal. John returned to Sozopolis where he continued to complain bitterly of the injustice he had suffered¹⁰⁰. Andronicos continued the effort to gain Athanasios' return, calling an assembly of the bishops in the city to approve his plans. When one-half of them refused to cooperate, Andronicos dropped canonical formalities and, with the support of only half the synod, enthroned Athanasios in the Church of St. Sophia on June 23, a few months short of ten years after he had resigned ¹⁰¹.

96. PACHYMERES, II, 369 - 370: ὄθεν καὶ ἡμέρας ἐκάστης ἐξ ἑωθινοῦ καὶ ἐκ νύκτα ἀνέδην τὰ πρὸς ἐκεῖνα ποιοῦμενοι ἄνθρωποι

97. PACHYMERES, II, 372.

98. PACHYMERES, II, 409 - 410.

99. PACHYMERES, II, 373.

100. PACHYMERES, II, 381 - 382.

101. PACHYMERES, II, 383 - 384; LAURENT, «La Chronologie», 148.

Although Athanasios began his second tenure with fully one-half the bishops in the city and many clergy and monks opposed to his authority, he did not change his methods and goals and continued with even greater intensity the motifs established from 1289 though 1293. The vast majority of his letters and his most substantial efforts at reform can be dated from his second patriarchate. He did not wish to moderate his convictions or his penchant for reform, especially in view of the social and ecclesiastical disintegration which was even greater after the military defeats in Asia Minor in 1302.

Some of the monks were so fearful of his austerity that they actually fled the city to Genoese Galata and joined Latin monastic communities ¹⁰². But eventually many of those bishops who had separated themselves from communion with the patriarch returned at the emperor's urging. Only Athanasios of Alexandria and several of his supporters held out against Athanasios, and in 1305 the emperor was forced to expel him. Unable to return to his see, the Alexandrian went to Crete to a house dependent on the monastery of St. Catherine of Sinai ¹⁰³.

In spite of the weakness of the patriarch's position and the coercion necessary to reestablish communion with a significant number of bishops and clergy, Athanasios demanded and received from Andronicos a promissory letter (*γράμμα υποσχετικών*), which was unknown until discovered among the letters of Athanasios in *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219. This document, extraordinary in the freedom of action it allows the reestablished patriarch, guarantees the freedom of the Church which was defined as the right to operate in conformity with its own canons, free from any type of civil interference prohibited by those canons. In the letter, whose style and content indicate that it was probably written by Athanasios himself, Andronicos promised to submit to the Church in all matters except those formally forbidden by law, and to conform to the will of God; in addition, he promised personal support to the patriarch and his ecclesiastical and social reforms. Andronicos especially committed himself to Athanasios' prime reform, the sending of the bishops back to their proper dioceses ¹⁰⁴.

102. PACHYMERES, II, 518 - 521; GREGORAS, I, 258 - 259.

103. PACHYMERES, II, 410.

104. V = 272v - 274r = *γράμμα υποσχετικών*, edited in LAURENT, «Ser-

The first paragraph of the promissory letter is a rambling statement on relations between church and state, beginning with an affirmation of the providence of God, who established the emperor and granted him great blessings; in return for all these gifts, visible and spiritual, Andronicos promised:

I declare, that I wish not only to keep the Church entirely free, but to have towards it the obedience of a slave and to submit myself to it in all that which is legal and conforms to the will of God, to have nothing more precious and to prefer nothing so much as its progress, security, and advancement ¹⁰⁵.

More specifically Andronicos referred to Athanasios:

Concerning the one who holds his function . . . by the good will of the Divinity through the means of a legal election as dispassionate as a sincere prayer made to God by the body of the Church, I will attach much value to supporting him in all that which I consider to be conforming to the commandments of God and the canons ¹⁰⁶.

The emperor's declaration, which contains an untruth - that Athanasios' second accession to the throne was accomplished by means of an election - contradicts Pachymeres' account, in which Andronicos, with the support of some bishops, simply declared Athanasios to be reestablished.

Andronicos went further and emphasized two of Athanasios' favorite themes - the freedom of the Church and the need for sound canonical order:

And if he [Athanasios] desires to revive certain laws of the Church which have fallen into disuse, if he wishes to turn out of the temple the sacrilege, whatever the level, by means of a spiritual whip, if he wishes to reform those who are called pastors, as well as the priests, the monks, the monasteries, and the churches, in a holy zeal and a righteous anger, I vow to support him ¹⁰⁷.

Andronicos threw his support behind the «pious pastor» and the

ment», 138 - 139. Laurent's discussion notes that the oath was most likely authored by Athanasios since there are many stylistic similarities between the oath and the patriarch's correspondence.

105. V = 272v - 273r.

106. V = 273r.

107. V = 273r.

Church for the classical rationale of Byzantine political ecclesiology:

[The clergy shall] intercede without cease to obtain for me, and for those who are dearest to me, health, salvation, and divine help, in order also to appease the anger of the Lord, who, because of our numerous sins, burdens Christians¹⁰⁸.

In these brief statements are contained some aspects typical of relations between the Byzantine *imperium* and *sacerdotium* as well as a pathetic affirmation of Andronicos' almost total submission to Athanasios' demands. Andronicos not only wanted Athanasios back on the ecumenical throne, but also desired the reforms which would please God and bring His good will upon the empire¹⁰⁹.

Unable to rely on the help of bishops and metropolitans, who were fundamentally hostile to his reform program and had to be coerced into accepting his authority, Athanasios needed all the support he could muster. Pachymeres attests to much good will on the part of the emperor, writing that Andronicos fulfilled Athanasios' will as if he were under his spell¹¹⁰. Athanasios' feelings towards Andronicos were warm, but critical, and in no way do his letters give the picture of unqualified imperial support which Pachymeres claims¹¹¹.

Political Ecclesiology

Let us now consider the relationship of Andronicos and Athanasios from the perspective of traditional Byzantine political ecclesiology, the reform endeavors of Athanasios, and the growing authority and prestige of the Byzantine Church. By accelerating the significant shift of influence from the *basileia* to the *hierosyne* - a shift which had been in process from the eighth century - , Athanasios altered the traditional pattern¹¹² while remaining con-

108. V = 273v.

109. V = 274r.

110. PACHYMERES, II, 616, also 579 - 580.

111. PACHYMERES, II, 518. OSTROGORSKY, *History*, 486 - 487.

112. MEYENDORFF, «Trends», 69 - 70. Ecclesiastical influence had grown to such an extent that by the mid-fourteenth century the *Traité d'Offices* of the Pseudo-Kodinos pictured an emperor almost totally submerged in liturgical practices; see GEORGE KODINOS (Pseudo), *Traité des Offices*, ed. by JEAN VERPEAUX (Paris, 1966). ANDRE GRABAR, «Pseudo-Codinus et les cérémonies de la cour byzantine au XIVe siècle», *Art et Société à Byzance sous les Paléo-*

sistent with the past in stressing the essential unity of the Byzantine polity. He does not interpret the empire as a society having parallel ecclesiastical and secular partners, but as a Christian commonwealth to which the analogy of theocratic Israel was the closest image; the modern usage of such terms as «church» and «state»¹¹³ does not reflect the reality of Byzantine political life which is more appropriately represented by the terms *hierosyne* and *basileia*. The basic assumption, that the *basileia* and the *hierosyne* were divine gifts to be coordinated in harmony (συμφωνία) with each other¹¹⁴, becomes problematic, however, since *symphonia* does not clearly delimit areas of responsibility. As we can see from the patriarch's letters, he considered the spiritual authority more pervasive than the secular, since all situations had spiritual analogies.

According to the philosophy of Justinian's Sixth Novel, the duty of the *imperium* was to support the *sacerdotium* in all things. In return for the prayers of an «honorable» priesthood, the empire would use its coercive power to secure the faith and good order of the Christian Church. God's grace towards the empire depended directly on the emperor's faithfulness to this task. Justinian's Novel specifically states that the empire will be restored to its full geographical extent as a result of this *symphonia* between the *imperium* and *sacerdotium*¹¹⁵. Athanasios often made the same promise, *mutatis mutandis*, to Andronicos: God will restore the full extent of the empire to the Romans, who have become, through their unfaithfulness and injustice, the laughingstock of their neigh-

loques, (Venice: Bibliothèque de l'Institut hellénique d'Études byzantines et post-byzantines de Venise, 1971), 200.

113. See the analysis in G. TELLENBACH, *Church, State, and Christian Society*, trans. by R.F. BENNETT, (Oxford: BASIL BLACKWELL, 1966); Tellenbach makes the valuable distinction between the use of the terms «Church and State» and «Imperium and Sacerdotium».

114. JUSTINIAN, Novel 6 in RUDOLFUS SCHOELL and G. KNOLL, (eds.), *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, III: *Novellae* (Berlin: Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1963), 35 - 36. On Justinian's political ecclesiology, see FRANCIS DVORNIK, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy*, Vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Press, 1966), 815 - 833. See also for the ninth - century, the *Epanagoge* in J. ZEPOS and P. ZEPOS, *Jus Graecoromanum*, II (Athens: GEORGE FEXIS, 1931). (I = *basileia*, II = patriarch), 240 - 243.

115. JUSTINIAN, Novel 6, in *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 35; and DVORNIK, *op. cit.*, 815 - 816.

bors ¹¹⁶. Athanasios, of course, would established the conditions for this restoration.

For Athanasios, the well-being of the Byzantine commonwealth in the most practical terms was inextricably bound up with both social justice and a well-ordered ecclesiastical system; the deliverance of the nation from multifaceted internal and external threats related in mathematical proportions to the degree of repentance and reform. The emperor's duty, Athanasios repeated with numbing regularity, was to effect these reforms and so to save the empire. If all the people, led by the example and legislation of the emperor, would repent, then Anatolia would be regained and «the rebellious Ishmaelites» (that is, the Turks) would be crushed. If, however, repentance were only partial, then God's beneficence would also be partial ¹¹⁷.

No modern author has mentioned the Scriptural prophetic theme so powerful in Athanasios' frequent references to Old Testament incidents and in his use of its terminology. Byzantium is identified with the New Israel, the people of God. In one letter to Andronicos, he affirmed that God has substituted the Orthodox people for ancient Israel (τὸν παλαιὸν Ἰσραήλ), whose claims have been cancelled and transferred to the Orthodox empire, which he created and to which he granted the *hierosyne* and the *basileia* ¹¹⁸. With such an identification comes a warning: Athanasios urged Andronicos to heed the warning to the Israelites, that if they do not bear fruit, the kingdom shall be taken from them (Matthew 21:43) and given over to the gentiles (τοῖς ἔθνεσι) ¹¹⁹. Over and over again, he repeated the theme that the people of God (ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λαός) are being delivered into the hands of «Ishmael» on account of their adultery, incest, perverted passions, sodomy, pederasty, intolerable blasphemy, sorcery, and injustice ¹²⁰.

Since the misfortunes of the Byzantines resulted from their social and ecclesiastical sins, the only salvation was to repent and

116. V = 230r - 232r (*Regestes*, 1589).

117. V = 17v (TALBOT, 37; *Regestes*, appendix 7).

118. V = 19r, (*Regestes*, 1692); cf. BANESCU, *op. cit.*, 48.

119. V = 66v (TALBOT, 82; *Regestes*, 1717); Athanasios here included a number of ominous scriptural warnings, especially that of the «barren fig tree».

120. V = 16v (TALBOT, 36; *Regestes*, 1639); Athanasios complained that immorality is especially rampant in the army where the soldiers, instead of marching with Christ, indulge in adultery and thievery.

turn to justice; quoting Psalm 126 (127): 1, he asserted that «except the Lord keep the city, the watchman watches in vain»¹²¹.

As his numerous references to Israel imply, Athanasios personally identified with the prophetic ministry of the Old Testament. In one letter condemning the presence of the Patriarch of Alexandria in Constantinople, he stated that someone must speak out against such evils and misdeeds and that the «God of marvels» has chosen to speak through «a certain heart and tongue», namely his own¹²². This Old Testament identification was evident also in his passion for ritual purity among the people, and especially among the priests. Like the sacrificial priesthood of Israel, he continually criticized the clergy for betraying the people¹²³. This Old Testament prophetic theme, though readily visible in his letters, is not mentioned by any modern authors.

Athanasios' attitude towards Andronicos demonstrated two political directions - the first traditional, the second subordinationist. In his letters he spoke of Andronicos in such traditional categories as Χριστός κυρίου¹²⁴, ἡ ἐκ Θεοῦ Βασιλεία σου¹²⁵, and terms such as Θεόσπεπτος, Θεοδόξαστος, and Θεοκυβέρνητος¹²⁶. Athanasios is well-founded in Byzantine political thought. Andronicos' reign was not just accidental; it was foreordained by God (προώρισε καὶ προέγνω)¹²⁷. Again, referring to Andronicos, he wrote that the Church had «wondrously reared and rightly justified» him to rule and reign¹²⁸.

121. V = 67v (TALBOT, 82; *Regestes*, 1717). The religious explanation for the loss of Byzantine Anatolia to the Turks was quite common. For example, see PACHYMERES, II, 581 - 583; for references throughout the fourteenth century, see SPEROS, VRYONIS, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh Century Through the Fifteenth Century* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971), 419 - 42

122. V = 48r (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 161¼): ἦν καὶ κεκράτηχε καὶ παρέθηξε γλώσσαν καὶ καρδίαν . . .

123. V = 229v - 230r (*Regestes*, 1778).

124. V = 1r (TALBOT, 1; *Regestes*, Appendix 3).

125. V = 1v (TALBOT, 2; *Regestes*, Appendix 2).

126. V = 82r (TALBOT, 110; *Regestes*, 1735).

127. V = 1r (TALBOT, 1; *Regestes*, Appendix 3).

128. V = 1r (TALBOT, 1; *Regestes*, Appendix 3). For Justinian, the *imperium* receives its authority immediately from God and not through the mediation of the Church; see DVORNIK, *op. cit.*, 720. With Athanasios there is a distinct shift towards ecclesiastical predominance.

In spite of the similarity between these affirmations and those of earlier periods, Athanasios' political ecclesiology represented a subordinationist transfer of authority and primacy to the Church. He claimed for instance, «For what other reason, I ask, did God adorn the Church with an empire, if not for the[exercise of] protection . . .?»¹²⁹. He reminded Andronicos, as he does in only one other place in his letters, that the emperor is the *epistemonarch* (ἐπιστημονάρχης) of the Church¹³⁰. Here *epistemonarch* describes the emperor's role in relation to the Church as almost exclusively protective and supportive. Although Athanasios seems to grant the emperor a great deal of authority over the Church, the context of the letter is quite the opposite: the patriarch was defining the end to which the imperial authority was created; that is, the emperor is established by God to be a new David, whose role is to support the *hierosyne*. In another letter Athanasios wrote concerning the «two powers», which, along with the four elements (fire, earth, air, water), were given to the people by the grace of God - «the priesthood and the emperors were given and tied to one another (ἀλλήλινδετα). The second power, the imperial, was, however, «given to protect the first and also to care for the good»¹³¹.

The function of the *basileia* is clear: to support and provide the coercive power necessary to enforce his reform program. Urging the emperor to care for the interest and well-being of the Church even before that of the empire, he reiterated:

For priesthood was not given to the Christian people for the sake of the kingship [basileia], but the kingship was given for the sake of the priesthood, so that by doing what is pleasing to God, the hand which is outside [i.e., the state] would support and take care of [the Church], which, while standing with the kingship, stands in its own right and is increased by God¹³².

129. V = 41v (TALBOT, 61; *Regestes*, 1704); V = 34r - 34v (TALBOT, 49; *Regestes*, 1695); cf. also *Epanagoge*, II, 1, 240.

130. V = 42r (TALBOT, 61; *Regestes*, 1704): ὀφείλομεν διδαχθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ αὐτῆς ἐπιστημονάρχου. . . . See also, V = 76r (TALBOT, 95; *Regestes*, 1725). On the definition of the word, see ANTON MICHEL, *Die Kaisermacht in der Ostkirche (843 - 1204)* (Darmstadt: HERMANN GENTNER VERLAG, 1959), 140 - 142.

131. V = 62r (*Regestes*, 1716).

132. V = 80v (Talbot, 104; *Regestes*, 1730): οὐ γὰρ διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν ἡ ἱερωσύνη ἀπεχαρίσθη τῷ Χριστιανύμῳ λαῷ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἡ βασιλεία, ἵνα πρὸς τὸ ἀρέσκον θεῷ τῇ ἕξω χειρὶ κρατύνουσα τῶν καὶ περιέπουσα καὶ συνι-

In this passage, Athanasios defined the *basileia* as that which is ἡ ἐξω χεῖρ and created by God to serve the Church, which is its own end, independent (ἀντικρατύνηται) of the secular authority. Since God had established the empire to serve the needs of the Church, Athanasios added that, patriarchal and canonical pressure having failed to return provincial bishops to their proper dioceses, Andronicos as *epistemonarch* should provide the necessary coercion and «staff the Church thickly with shepherds» and not with «hirelings»¹³³. The consistency of Athanasios' affirmations powerfully demonstrates how seriously he intended the term *epistemonarch* as the first responsibility of the emperor - nothing should come before the care of the Church.

The Church for Athanasios possessed its own internal dynamic, which was not to be encumbered and to which even the emperor was obliged to submit. Not only did he consider the imperial *au-toritas* external to the Church, but the emperor, as a son of the Church, personally subject to its laws and needs.

For this I entreat that we should be discrete and learn to submit to the Church, and not to subject the Church, but to be subject to her and her law and not stand against her recklessly¹³⁴.

Carrying on the same theme, he wrote to Andronicos:

I entreat you that during your reign the Church of Christ enjoy freedom and not [be] tied with string¹³⁵.

All of these appeals for the freedom of the Church are understandable in the context of Athanasios' reform struggle against secular interference and those who «put their hands on the Church», as well as against unworthy clerics and monastics who are permitted to live as if they had no restrictions on their behavior¹³⁶.

Athanasios' belief that the shame of the empire was that it did not serve the Church and that this failure had made the empire

στῶσα, ἀντικρατύνηται πάλιν αὐτῇ καὶ συνίσταται ἀξιομένη ὑπὸ Θεοῦ. The translation of this passage does not correspond with Talbot's which does not adequately express the strength of the terms ἡ ἐξω χεῖρ or ἀντικρατύνηται.

133. V = 42r (TALBOT, 61; *Regestes*, 1704).

134. V = 62r - 63v (*Regestes*, 1716).

135. V = 38r (TALBOT, 57; *Regestes*, 1701).

136. V = 63v (*Regestes*, 1716); text appears in GENNADIOS OF HELIOPOLIS, *Ἱστορία τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριαρχείου*. I (Athens: 1953), 309. Gennadios assumes that Athanasios was attacking imperial interference.

prey to foreigners¹³⁷ and the smallest of nations¹³⁸ represents a significant change from the notions of Constantine and the Sixth Novel. For them the Church existed to offer supplication to God and played a passive role; for Athanasios, the Church was the essential substance without which the empire could not exist - an affirmation impossible in earlier centuries when the empire was stronger and the Church possessed a less determined leadership.

Besides this qualitative precedence over the empire, Athanasios asserted a chronological precedence for the Church as well. He affirmed, for instance, that soon after the establishment of the Church on a «rock» (Matthew 16:18), God crowned «Her with the supreme imperial power, so that [she] might be served in all matters pleasing to God and be supported by the imperial power»¹³⁹. Pope Gregory VII might make such a claim to a German emperor, but in this instance from the pen of a Byzantine patriarch quite the opposite is historically the case, since the Roman Empire existed as a political entity before the Church came into being. Perhaps Athanasios was referring to the conversion of Constantine and the *pax ecclesiae*.

Had Andronicos been a stronger leader and Athanasios a less determined personality, the developments of the period might have been quite different. Personalities, contrary to Talbot's opinion that the play of personalities «to some extent» influenced these developments, were decisive. Athanasios, a stronger figure than Andronicos, took the initiative and carried political and ecclesiastical developments to their logical conclusions. His political ecclesiology was motivated not so much by his sense of the importance of the patriarchal office, or even his aggressive nature, as by the leadership vacuum created by Andronicos. As the empire decayed morally, politically, and territorially, «the emperor acted as if he were asleep»¹⁴⁰. Athanasios, continually horrified by the situation of both the empire and the Church, even expressed the wish that he were not alive to see such conditions¹⁴¹. He complained to Andro-

137. V = 20v (*Regestes*, 1692).

138. V = 64v (*Regestes*, 1716).

139. V = 41r (TALBOT, 61; *Regestes*, 1704); cf. V = 80v (TALBOT, 104; *Regestes*, 1730).

140. PACHYMERES, II, 412; see also MICHEL, *op. cit.*, 8 - 10; 214 - 215.

141. V = 9r (TALBOT, 15; *Regestes*, 1611).

nicos that nothing was being done to correct the abuses and that «universal lawlessness had, like an irresistible flame, enveloped all the Roman territory twice over, and only you, after God, can stop this»¹⁴². In Athanasios' mind clear compulsion existed for the emperor to correct abuses; the frustration apparent in his letters records the dearth of such action. Nevertheless, the relationship between the two was genuine and sincere¹⁴³. Athanasios, attempting to convince Andronicos to institute certain reform measures, reminded him that there were few he could trust who were not self-serving flatterers and assured him that you have not found anyone who loves you as I do, and who makes his own your joy in salvation, or anyone who commiserates with you as I do at the grievous events which afflict us. . . .¹⁴⁴

Athanasios, however, was too much of a realist to rely on the goodwill of the emperor alone to achieve his ends. He played upon the privileges of his role as Andronicos' spiritual father, frankly affirming that Andronicos, seemingly as a matter of faith, must follow his advice at all times¹⁴⁵. Athanasios defined their mutual obligation: «on the one hand I should speak and compel and demand what is fitting for you, and on the other hand you ought constantly to show your abundant zeal to heed and carry out <my suggestions>»¹⁴⁶. Continuing in this same vein, he asked rhetorically what is the characteristic (καὶ τὸ τοῦτο;) which above all else is common to men who aspire to piety and virtue? That characteristic, he told Andronicos, is to refer everything in life, after God, to his spiritual father and «to converse more frequently with him than all other men»¹⁴⁷. Well aware that Andronicos was surrounded by advisors opposed to his influence and reforms, Athanasios

142. V = 33v (TALBOT, 49; *Regestes*, 1695).

143. Athanasios attempted several times to heal the estrangement between Andronicos and his wife, Irene; see GREGORAS, I, 182; V = 3r - 3v (TALBOT, 3; *Regestes*, 1673).

144. V = 39v (TALBOT, 59; *Regestes*, 1703).

145. V = 74v (TALBOT, 92; *Regestes*, 1724). This letter dates from the latter part of Athanasios' second reign when his influence over Andronicos had almost completely eroded.

146. V = 74v (TALBOT, 92; *Regestes*, 1724): τὸ μὲν λέγειν ἡμᾶς καὶ βιάζειν καὶ ἀξιούν ἀρμόζον ὑμῖν τὸ ὑπακοῦειν δὲ καὶ πληροῦν διηνεκῆς αὐτῇ καὶ πλοῦτος καὶ σπουδασμα . . .

147. V = 74v (TALBOT, 92; *Regestes*, 1724): τὸ ἀνηρτῆσθαι μετὰ Θεὸν ὅσα τῇ ἐκ Θεοῦ βασιλεία σου κατὰ πνεῦμα πατρί, . . .

wrote elsewhere that one of the essential virtues of good rulership demands that the emperor consult his spiritual father, to whom is given «much paternal assurance and assistance and direction, which qualities accrue only to a truly spiritual <father>, not to those who speak only to curry favor and to lightly debase truth and righteousness for worldly motives»¹⁴⁸ This is not only a statement of political ecclesiology, but an effort to «force» Andronicos to act on his demands for reform at a time when his influence was most likely waning.

As indicated in the promissory letter, Athanasios based his program on the belief that the empire would be saved only through repentance and the purification of the Church and society. He sought to institute his proposed reforms, not only by preaching, as his correspondence proves abundantly, but by urging the often feeble intervention of the civil power as well. To Athanasios' credit, he showed the same passion for the social and material well-being of the people of Constantinople.

Social Reforms

Athanasios' reforming zeal went beyond the concern for simple good order in the Church; he was equally concerned with social justice and the restructuring of Byzantine society. Matschke develops an interesting thesis, albeit from a Marxist perspective, that Athanasios' social reforms played the reactionary role of maintaining the failing Byzantine social structure. He offers a Halévy-type thesis, with the patriarch playing a socially mollifying role¹⁴⁹. Matschke's approach does not, however, do justice to the genuine compassion which Athanasios had for the people of the city, regardless of the historical role he may have played in heading off a social upheaval.

Athanasios, a man of the city, knew from both observation and investigation of the human suffering and oppression that exis-

148. V = 75r (TALBOT, 92; *Regestes*, 1724).

149. KLAUS - PETER MATSCHKE, «Politik und Kirche im spätbyzantinischen Reich: Athanasios I, Patriarch von Konstantinopel (1289 - 1293; 1303 - 1309), *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl - Marx - Universität Leipzig, Gesellschafts und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*. XV (1966), 482, n. 56. Matschke writes that to deflect social tensions, Athanasios sought to tie the lower classes to the state «damit verbunden war jedoch des Bemühen, die sozialen Spannungen zu entschärfen, ihren gewaltsamen Ausbruch zu verhindern, die Unterschichten eng an den Staat und die Klasse, die ihn trug, zu ketten».

ted within the capital. We have already seen that Andronicos commissioned him to hold a type of court in which he could hear complaints, pass judgments, and make recommendations to Andronicos. Many normal and traditional urban services and channels of bureaucracy had broken down, and Athanasios' role was to some extent the role that the Prefect of the City had once played. Even after he was reestablished on the patriarchal throne, he continued to hear cases, sometimes, it seems, with the help of the permanent synod. On one occasion he wrote to Andronicos that the synod had met to come to the aid of men «stepped on by hunger and even especially poverty, from which they are not able to escape»¹⁵⁰. Since Byzantine social life was characterized by large-scale corruption, the cases which came to Athanasios' attention were usually instances of exploitation by civil and ecclesiastical officials and by merchants. He wrote to Andronicos, revealing a profound Christian political philosophy, that

when men to whom the great God has not given an emperor are wronged by certain people, they are consoled by the expectation that they will be avenged in the world to come; but when through the grace of Christ, men have been granted an emperor, . . . they perish of sorrow if they do not see him defending truth and righteousness.

Referring to officials, he continued by saying that the emperor must restrain the wicked (τὸν ἀναχαιτισμὸν τῶν κακῶν) from exploiting the people¹⁵¹.

Athanasios' most vehement attacks fell on agents of the fisc (οἱ ἐνεργῶντες) who were not investigated as he had recommended, but were allowed to persist in their injustices and exploitation of the people¹⁵². However, the patriarch allowed for the possibility that Andronicos might have been misled by some of his ministers and on their advice took no corrective measures. At one point, after praising Andronicos' good works, he urged him not to allow them to be curtailed by ambition, relationships, or the inhumanity of the tax collector (φορολόγων ἀπικνηρωπίαι), but to require the agents of the fisc to conform to the law and cease milking the people in

150. V = 76v (TALBOT, 96; *Regestes*, 1664). GUILLAND, «Correspondances», 66.

151. V = 10v - 11r (TALBOT, 18; *Regestes*, 1679).

152. V = 16v (TALBOT, 36; *Regestes*, 1639): ὅτι ἐκρόβη ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ δικαιοσύνη καὶ κρίσις καὶ ἔλεος. . . .

order to build their personal fortunes¹⁵³. These tax collectors, he warned, wanted to destroy the Roman state and the people, and only the emperor could save the empire by enforcing the laws of the nation and the canons of the Church.

On the problem of the refugees who were filling the city after the several military defeats of 1302, Athanasios complained that Andronicos never even ordered that an investigation be made of certain charges which he had made and particularly attacked the lack of action and the veniality of the hetaeriarch, the official who dealt with refugees:

How often, when I have reported to you about the matter, has your divine majesty ordered the hetaeriarch either to accompany me in an investigation of the truth, or to arrange a just and true redress of things which I have reported, not to satisfy my personal desire, but because this is the will of God and brings glory and honor . . . to your majesty . . .¹⁵⁴

Athanasios probably wanted the official to go with him to investigate a problem of the refugees - a problem of housing or victuals, perhaps - , but instead the hetaeriarch devoted his time to personal gain and deceiving the emperor with the guise of meekness, a brand of hypocrisy particularly disgusting to Athanasios. Athanasios then suggested that perhaps the hetaeriarch's absence was preferable since he would simply try to search out personal gain in others' suffering¹⁵⁵. Athanasios was particularly angered by the behavior of Nicephoros Choumnos, who became one of Andronicos' most trusted advisors as mesazon, or chancellor, and was related to the imperial family through the marriage of his daughter Irene to one of the emperor's sons¹⁵⁶. Without mentioning specif-

153. V = 65l.e. - 65v (*Regestes*, 1716).

154. V = 41R (TALBOT, 60; *Regestes*, 1654); see GUILLAND, «Correspondance», 61; on the hetaeriarch, see PSEUDO - KODINOS, *Traité*, 178, 186, where the office is described as minor and assistant to the grand hetaeriarch. Laurent assumes that Athanasios is here attacking the grand hetaeriarch who would have had direct contact with the emperor; cf. *Regestes*, 1654, and DÖLGER, *op. cit.*, 2266.

155. V = 41r (TALBOT, 60; *Regestes*, 1654).

156. V = 17v (TALBOT, 37; *Regestes*, appendix 7). On the office of mesazon, see RAYMOND LEONERTZ, «Le chancelier imperial à Byzance au XIVE et au XIIIe siècle», *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* XXVI (1960), 275 - 300; also PSEUDO - KODINOS, *Traité*, Chapt. 5, where the office is described as the actual seat of power and not merely an aulic distinction. See MATSCHKE, *op. cit.*, 483, on Athanasios' dislike for Choumnos.

ic changes, Athanasios attacked him as typical of the corrupt officials who built great fortunes at the expense of the people.

Athanasios frequently complained of bribery and favoritism, urging as a solution that all things be done in mutuality and without reference to bribes, blood, or any other consideration. He warned Andronicos to find men who could do their jobs honestly, in a God-pleasing manner; if the emperor was not able to find such men, Athanasios himself would make suggestions or find them ¹⁵⁷. During the famine of the winter of 1306/1307 he suggested the names of several men, monastic and lay, to staff a grain supply commission for the city ¹⁵⁸ and in one instance, became so angry at grain speculators that he actually ordered, «through words and persuasion», the warehouses of the wealthy, merchants, and other speculators to be opened. The general population was then fed from public kitchens which he established around the city to ease the effects of famine ¹⁵⁹. Athanasios also urged Andronicos to tour the walls of the city and see to the cases of guards who, unable to bribe their supervisors, had lost their jobs ¹⁶⁰. Such was the pathetic level of Byzantine civil life.

Although in Anatolia the Catalan Company was victorious on behalf of the Byzantines, Athanasios warned Andronicos that without reforms the victory of the Turks would be inevitable and further warned him not to rely on foreign and mercenary armies, because even «if all the West united itself to help us» it would do nothing for us ¹⁶¹. Athanasios disliked the Catalan Company, not only for its Latin Christianity, but because it represented a deceptive military solution to the problems of the empire. He concluded that if the Byzantines truly wanted to save both themselves «and the world», each would have to recognize his own duty towards the community, «especially those who administer public affairs, both

157. V = 13v (TALBOT, 29; *Regestes*, 1687).

158. V = 78v (TALBOT, 100; *Regestes*, 1727); and V = 75r - 75r (TALBOT, 93; *Regestes*, 1652).

159. TVA, 48 - 49; LAIOU, «Provisioning», 99 - 101.

160. V = 9v - 10r (TALBOT, 17; *Regestes*, 1612), where he mentions a Dositheos who had so suffered.

161. V = 17r (TALBOT, 37; *Regestes*, Appendix 7). BANESCU, «Athanasios», 44 - 45, and PAUL LEMERLE, *L'Émirat d'Aydin: Byzance et l'Occident* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957), 16 - 17.

ecclesiastical and civil»¹⁶². This call for mutuality, which was the underpinning of Athanasios' social and ecclesiastical reforms, fully supports the thesis that he sought to impose monastic categories on all of Byzantine society.

The Neara

In 1303 Andronicos, in his so-called promissory letter to Athanasios, guaranteed the patriarch free reign and imperial support in his reform zeal; the publication of the *Neara* was one of the few actual concessions the emperor made to Athanasios in keeping with his earlier oath¹⁶³. One of the most significant results of Athanasios' reforming zeal, the ζήτησις or *Neara*, is a series of disciplinary measures issued from the *synodos endemousa* in 1304. Even though the legislation came out of the synod and was signed by twenty-one bishops, including two bishops-elect (ὑποψήφιοι), it bears the unmistakable mark of Athanasios' reforming zeal and largely reflects the contents of his correspondence. At the request of the bishops and Athanasios, Andronicos confirmed the ζήτησις as civil law in May, 1306, after which it was properly referred to as the *Neara* or New Law. The appeal to the emperor indicates the intimate cooperation between the *imperium* and *sacerdotium* in Byzantium while the very content of the *Neara*, dealing as it does with questions both moral and civil, indicates that with the decay of civil administration, including the exercise of justice, Athanasios increasingly cast himself in the role of civil arbiter. As we saw earlier, on the basis of his popularity among the people, he was functioning in a quasi-judicial capacity even before his second patriarchate.

The fact that ecclesiastical legislation, largely ethical in tone, became civil law is not as significant as the patriarch's effort to *initiate* legislation in civil questions. Ecclesiastical canons promulgated as civil law were quite common in Byzantine tradition, and, as a result of the intimate association between ecclesiastical and imperial authority, the Church often sought imperial support for

162. V = 17r (TALBOT, 37; *Regestes*, appendix 7): οἱ διοικοῦντες τὰ δημόσια ἐξαιρέτως καὶ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.

163. For a discussion of the γράμμα ὑποσχετικόν, see LAURENT, «Le serment», 138 - 139 where the text of the oath appears.

theological and disciplinary legislation¹⁶⁴. Ecclesiastical canons and Church teaching were, in fact, confirmed by imperial legislation, becoming the law of the state. Justinian in his Sixth Novel affirmed the equality of both civil and ecclesiastical law; the canons of the first four ecumenical councils, for instance, were backed by the coercive power of the state¹⁶⁵. The problem inherent in such a relationship is self evident. Not only is Christian morality of necessity a voluntary commitment, but largely concerned with things private; actions which are not open to public verification are only with great difficulty prosecuted publicly.

The *Neara* has been preserved in both a long and a short recension in several different manuscripts. The longer recension appears to have been a reediting of the shorter version which came out of the synod in 1304 and was a result of additions made by the patriarchal and the imperial chancelleries. While there is some debate as to which of the recensions was produced by the fathers of the *synodos endemousa* and which was published officially, the fact that the longer version was included in the *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219 supports the belief that it received the official approbation of both the government and the Church. Laurent suggests that so long a period of time between the appearance of the short and the long editions was due to the opposition of a significant number of ecclesiastical and lay officials¹⁶⁶.

164. Much has been written on the relationship of the imperial power to the Church and the term Caesaropapism is all too familiar. Although justified in certain specific cases, it cannot be applied here. What is here described is an instance of Justinian's *symphonia*, with the balance in favor of ecclesiastical initiative. The best available discussion of this relationship is DVORNIK, *op. cit.*, 718 - 723; see also JOAN HUSSEY, *The Byzantine World* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961), 92 and DENO GEANAKOPOLOS, *Byzantine East and Latin West* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966), 55 - 83. The term «nomocanon» properly applied to ecclesiastical laws which had, in addition, the force of civil law.

165. A classic example of this is the famous Novel 131, chapter 1, of Justinian; *Novellae* in R. SCHOELL and W. KROLL (eds.), *Corpus Juris Civilis*, III (Berlin, 1863), 38. In this location the canons of the first four Ecumenical Councils are declared to be on a par with the Holy Scripture and are proclaimed to have universal authority and the force of law. For a discussion of the equally famous Novel 6, see DVORNIK, *op. cit.*, 815 - 818.

166. LAURENT, *Regestes*, 393 - 395 for a discussion of the two recensions and the dating of the various manuscripts. The long recension appears in *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219, 50v - 52r and published in J. ZEPOS and P. ZEPOS, *Jus Graec-*

The *Neara*, which opens with a hortatory supplication (ζήτηση) to the emperor to govern righteously and correctly, urges the emperor to use his divinely-originated authority to consecrate as the law of the empire the series of disciplinary measures which had been approved by the patriarch and the bishops and which would be beneficial to the empire. The *Neara*, like many of Athanasios' letters, covers a variety of civil, moral, and ecclesiastical issues, including testation, marriage, rape, adultery, prostitution, murder, monastic discipline, the functioning of taverns and bath houses, and the observance of the fasts. Regulations enacted have a clear two-fold aim — to eliminate social injustices and to correct moral infractions.

The *Neara* contains one of the few new laws originating in the last centuries of the Byzantine empire concerning testation.

Although many of Athanasios' reforms are quite traditional his so-called trimoiria or tri-partite division of an inheritance is exceptional¹⁶⁷. In the situation in which a husband or a wife died, leaving no children, the surviving spouse was not to be deprived of some share of the deceased's estate. The reason was simple *phil-*

coromanum, I, ex editione K.E. ZACHARIAE VON LINGENTHAL (Athens: Scientia Aalen, 1962), 533 - 536. For the short recension, see text in G.A. RHALLES and M. POTLES, *Σύνταγμα τῶν Οσίων καὶ Ἱερῶν Κανόνων* (Athens, 1855), V, 121 - 126. In general, there is very little literature on the *Neara* and almost nothing in English. K.E. ZACHARIAE VON LINGENTHAL, *Geschichte des griechisch-römischen Rechts* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1892), 141 - 143; J.A., MORTEUIL, *Historie du droit byzantin ou du droit romain dans l'empire d'Orient depuis la mort de Justinien jusqu' à la prise de Constantinople en 1453*, III. (Paris: E. GUILBERT, 1846), 393; FRANZ DÖLGER, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen*, IV (Munich - Berlin: Beck'sche Verlag, 1960), 2295; P. LEMERLE, *op. cit.*, 318 - 333.

167. K. TRIANTAPHYLLOPOULOS, «Die Novelle des Patriarchen Athanasios über die "τριμοιρία"», *Byzantinisch - neugriechische Jahrbücher* VIII (1931) 136. This work is the most extensive piece of literature relating to any particular aspect of the *Neara*. Also, J. ZHISHMAN, *Das Eherecht der orientalischen Kirche* (Vienna: WILHELM BRAUMÜLLER, 1864), 177, 675; and ZACHARIAE VON LINGENTHAL, *op. cit.*, 141. TRIANTAPHYLLOPOULOS, *op. cit.*, 146, notes that the legislation is unique in Byzantium and may have had its origin in Syrian law sources on which both the Byzantine and the Nestorian Churches drew. He is careful to point out that he does not believe that Athanasios had before him Syrian law sources, but rather that the trimoiria has its source in the «general law» of the hellenized east. Both churches standing as theological antagonists shared a common legal background.

anthropia: the survivor should not have to suffer the double calamity (διπλῆν συμφορὰν) of losing both house and wealth (ἀβιώτος) ¹⁶⁸. Instead of the estate being appropriated by the local church, monastic community, or landlord to whom the deceased may have belonged as paroikos (dependent peasant) ¹⁶⁹, it was to be divided into three parts according to the following formula: one-third to the government, town, or master of the deceased (ὁ ἀπελθὼν); one-third to the local church for the so-called service of his soul; and finally one-third to the surviving spouse. If, however, there were no surviving spouse, this final third would go to the deceased's father, mother, sibling, or other person recognized as heir by law. If there were no other legal heir, then this final third was divided with one-sixth of the original estate going to the government fisc and one-sixth to the church ¹⁷⁰. Before emperor Leo VI, who extended the right of inheritance to the wife by Novel 106 ¹⁷¹, the wife often inherited nothing when her husband died ¹⁷².

Section four of the *Neara* takes up a similar theme and calls for the repeal of the Law (νόμος ἀκυρωθῆ) according to which when a

168. RHALLES and POTLES, V, 122, and ZEPOS and ZEPOS, I, 534. The shorter recension makes use of the word ἀβιωτικὸν to describe the state of the widow or widower. It is most likely making reference to the ἀβιωτικὸν which is described as «the ancient custom by which the legacy of the deceased paroikos is divided between the master and μνημόσυνά without taking account of the spouse or the nearest surviving relative». Quoted from Paul Lemerle, by LAURENT, *Rezestes*, 394.

169. RHALLES and POTLES, 123: τῶν εἰς παροικίαν ἐχόντων αὐτούς, ἧ καὶ Ἐκκλησιῶν, ἧ καὶ μονῶν. Laiou writes that in the 14th century the landlord inherited the property of a paroikos who died childless. ANGELIKI LAIOU - THOMADAKIS, *Peasant Society in the Late Byzantine Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 55, 92. According to this section of the *Neara* the landlord would inherit at most one-third of the estate. Like many of Athanasios' reforms, these testamentary regulations probably fell into desuetude almost immediately.

170. RHALLES and POTLES, 123: τῆ δεσποτεία τὸ ἦμισυ καὶ μνημόσυνοις χάριν ἐκείνου τὸ ἦμισυ. The use of τῆ δεσποτεία in the short recension implies the master of the paroikos. The use, however, in the same section of τῶ δημόσιω in the long recension, ZEPOS and ZEPOS, 534, implies «to a public authority». The shorter version is clearer as to who inherits, but the more generalized reference to ὁ δημόσιος in the longer recension was promulgated a law.

171. P. NOAILLES and A. DAIN (eds.), *Les Nouvelles de Leon VI le Sage* (Paris: Société d'édition «les Belles Lettres», 1944), 347.

172. Justinian's Novels 53 and 118 modified this slightly.

husband or a wife died leaving a child and in turn the child died then the surviving spouse inherited all of the child's inheritance from the deceased parent. For Athanasios this was an unjust law inasmuch as the parents of the deceased spouse were left without anything from their son or daughter's wealth. For Athanasios the grandparents were subject, as in section one, to a double loss of their child and their wealth which the child might have received from them as a gift or dowry. According to the Neara, the law should be changed so that on the death of the child, one third of what he had inherited from his deceased parent should go to the church for «remembrance» (μνημόσυνα), one third to the parents of the deceased, and one third to the spouse of the deceased ¹⁷³. Nothing is designated in this instance for the master of the formerly deceased parent.

The social emphasis of Athanasios' legislation is evident: the part of the inheritance which was set aside for μνημόσυνα was understood to be for the general welfare and the relief of the poor of the community ¹⁷⁴ rather than for clergy in payment for having performed a funeral service or memorials. The Church was to oversee the family's distribution of this money, the so-called soul-part, to the poor ¹⁷⁵.

The sense of social mutuality evident in sections one and four is also evident in section five which requires a murderer to be punished according to the law, though not to be deprived of his property and wealth since this would not punish the murderer but his family and wife. Accordingly, the malefactor's property should be divided among his children, with a part assigned to the survivors of the victim and yet another part assigned to the fisc ¹⁷⁶.

173. RHALLES and POTLES, 124; ZEPOS and ZEPOS, 535. The law which is being repealed is Novel 118 of Justinian, which held that an immediate heir closes out all other heirs. The synod held it to be unjust that the paternal grandfather's fortune should go to his son's wife and hence pass out of the family from which it originated.

174. TRIANTAPHYLLOPOULOS, *op. cit.*, 137.

175. The Patriarch Josiah of Constantinople offered in a judgment of 1325, based on Athanasios' Neara, that the «soul part» shall be divided one half for the mother and one half for the grandfather of the child with the understanding that the money shall be issued in services to the poor; see MIKLOSICH and MÜLLER, *op. cit.*, I, 134; also see discussion in TRIANTAPHYLLOPOULOS, *op. cit.*, 138.

176. RHALLES and POTLES, 124 - 125; ZEPOS and ZEPOS, 535.

The second section of the *Neara* takes up the theme, common in Athanasios' correspondence, of punishment of a variety of sexual offenses and perversions, crimes such as prostitution, adultery, sodomy, incest, magic, and injustice which both excite the anger of God and incite the loss of souls¹⁷⁷. He did not, however, suggest the means by which these prohibitions should be enforced or offenders punished. Well aware of corrupt judicial administration, he did warn judges to be honest in applying these laws without regard to gift or station; leaders, he reminded Andronicos, are not for mere decoration, but for action. Athanasios was well aware of the corrupt judicial administration in the capital.

The third section, on prostitution, orders that no woman shall «be forced sexually in any way, especially if she is a virgin». If, however, she relinquished her honor willingly, her hair should be cut and she should be paraded in public. In the latter case, no theft was involved; since she entered the liaison willingly, nothing was taken from her¹⁷⁸. In the first case, the seducer had to pay a fine to the fisc, but if he possessed no wealth, he was subject to normal punishment¹⁷⁹. In the longer recension, a section calls for the confiscation of the goods of the proprietor of a brothel. In one letter, Athanasios placed under the ban of excommunication the owners of brothels and those who lure women into prostitution either by force or on the pretext of marriage (συνουχεσίου ὀνόματι οἱ ἀρπάζοντες γύναια)¹⁸⁰. Similarly those «who give or take abortions to destroy children» were subject to the same penance as murderers¹⁸¹.

In general, sexual morality was a prime concern for Athanasios; his teaching letters and his letters to the bishops urge the excommunication of men or women who indulge in sexual intercourse prior to the blessing¹⁸². In a letter to priests, Athanasios ordered

177. ΖΕΡΟΣ AND ΖΕΡΟΣ, 535.

178. *Ibid.*, 535. Athanasios repeats the same point in V = 139r (*Regestes*, 1747).

179. DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 2295, where he refers to the normal punishment as branding and flogging.

180. V = 139v (*Regestes*, 1747).

181. V = 235r (*Regestes*, 1779): τὰς διδούσας καὶ λαμβανούσας τὰ ἀμβλωθρί διαπρὸς ἀναίρεσιν τῶν βρεφῶν καὶ τὰς τὰ βρέφη ριπτούσας ἐπιτιμίῳ φονέων ὑποκεῖσθαι διδάσκοντες. See also Canon 21 of the Council of Ancyra (RHALLÉS AND

182. V = 226r (*Regestes*, 1777): μὴ δὲ προ στεφάνου καὶ εὐλογίας γνωρίζειν.

that couples continuing illicit liaisons be forbidden the sacraments and turned over to the public officials (τῷ δημοσίῳ παράπεμπε), presumably for punishment¹⁸³. Concerned also for the purity of marriage, he ordered that any person contracting a second or a third, unless there are no children, «must be given a penance»¹⁸⁴. In another letter, he prohibited a priest from celebrating the festivities (μὴ ἐστιᾶσθαι) of a person marrying for a second or third time although canon law permitted such marriages¹⁸⁵.

Pachymeres records the meeting of a synod in which Andronicos and Athanasios led the examination of the question of whether fornication dissolved the betrothal bond¹⁸⁶. Since the opinion of the

POTLES, III, 63); Canon 2 of St. Basil (RHALLÉS and POTLES, IV, 96); Canon 91 of the Council in Trullo (RHALLÉS and POTLES, II, 518) for ecclesiastical legislation condemning abortions.

183. V = 226r (*Regestes*, 1777).

184. V = 140r (*Regestes*, 1747): οἱ γάμω δευτέρω ἀλόντες ἢ τρίτῳ ὁ καὶ πορνείαν κεκολασμένην φασίν, εἰ παῖδες μὴ πρόσεια μὴ δὲ ὄρα πρὸς τὸ ἐξῶρον, προσφόρῳ ἐπιτιμίῳ λατρευέσθωσαν. Byzantine nomocanonical legislation had been firmly established on the question of successive marriages from the time of the *Tomos Unionis* of 920 which settled the affair of the Tetragamia, the conflict surrounding the fourth marriage of the Emperor Leo VI; for a general discussion of the centrality of this question in the Byzantine ecclesiastical tradition, see J.L. BOOJAMRA, «The Eastern Schism of 907 and the Affair of the Tetragamia», *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XXV (April, 1974), 113 - 133. Although the Church had traditionally condemned second and third marriages and subjected those who entered into them to ecclesiastical penances, no real issue developed until the tenth century when civil law was brought into conformity with canon law (Novel 90 of Leo VI in NOAILLES and DAIN, *op. cit.*, 299). The responsibility for marriage came formally into the province of the Church; the Church had to decide whether to marry a person for a second or a third time. The *Tomos Unionis* explicitly forbade all fourth marriages. For second and third marriages a sliding scale of penances was established which took into account the age of the persons and whether or not they had children by a previous marriage (RHALLÉS and POTLES, V, 6 - 7). For Byzantine ecclesiastical legislation prior to the tenth century, see Canon 3 of the Council of Neocaesarea (RHALLÉS and POTLES, III, 74); Canon I of the Council of Laodecia (RHALLÉS and POTLES, III, 171); Canons 4, 50, 80 of St. Basil (RHALLÉS and POTLES, IV, 102, 203, 242).

185. V = 224r (*Regestes*, 1776): γάμω διγάμου. πολλῶ δὲ τριγάμου. ἱερέα μὴ ἐστιᾶσθαι. A similar prohibition on the clergy, reflecting Byzantine ecclesiastical *distaste* for multiple successive marriages, is found in V = 229r (*Regestes*, 1778).

186. PACHYMERES, II, 181.

synod was divided and a conclusion never reached the question seems to have been left in Athanasios' hand. The hesitation of the synod to publish a conclusion is remarkable inasmuch as a synodal decree under the patriarch John VIII Xiphilinos (1066) had obtained the force of law by a chrysobul of Nicephoros III Botaniates. Engagement began to be accompanied by an ecclesiastical blessing and was assumed to be the first stage in the marriage itself, carrying with it the same consequences for violations as marriage¹⁸⁷. In another letter, Athanasios forbade intercourse between affianced people prior to marriage¹⁸⁸ and he imposed a penance on the parents who permitted their daughter to sleep with her fiance before the «crowning ceremony», that is after the engagement¹⁸⁹. Athanasios also condemned consanguinous marriages, including relationships created by adoptions (τὸ ἐξ υἰοθεσίας), within the degrees of prohibition, as well as marriages between individuals of radically differing ages and between strangers if there were no witness present to affirm that neither partner was already married¹⁹⁰. The obvious problem remained the need not only to detect the «hidden crime» and to prosecute it, but to devise appropriate punishments¹⁹¹. Such laws were purely rhetorical, proclaiming what ought to be; legal enforcement was another matter.

Athanasios completed the centuries-long process of bringing marriage completely within the province of the Church. The longer version of the *Neara* affirms that marriages must be performed by the couple's parish (ἐνορία) priest or with his knowledge¹⁹². For the

187. *Regestes*, 896 and 915; cf. MORTEUIL, *op. cit.*, 150.

188. V = 226r (*Regestes*, 1777).

189. V = 229r (*Regestes*, 1778).

190. V = 224r (*Regestes*, 1776): ἀγνώστους λαμβάνειν γυναῖκες. εἰ μὴ μαρτυρηθῶσι μὴ ἔχειν. A similar prohibition is contained in V = 226v (*Regestes*, 1777). The canonical age for marriage in Byzantium was usually 12 years for a girl and 14 for a boy; H.G. BECK, *op. cit.*, 88; also Novel 109 of Leo VI in NOAILLES and DAIN, *op. cit.*, 355, 357.

191. On the difficulty of prosecuting moral offenses as civil crimes and the Byzantine legislation related to this problem, see ZHISHMAN, *op. cit.*, 16 - 17. Zhishman points out that later Byzantine legislation not surprisingly avoided the prosecution of private moral offenses.

192. ZEPOS and ZEPOS, 536: Ἀφορίζομεν τοὺς συνιστάνασι θέλοντας συνοικέσια μὴ τῆς βουλῆς ἄνευ τοῦ ἱερέως, παρ' ᾧ καὶ ἐκκλησιάζονται. ὁ γὰρ μὴ οὕτω ποιῶν

first time in Byzantine canonical legislation, the priest is clearly defined as the agent of the rite. Despite the tenth century legislation of Leo VI and the eleventh century legislation of Alexios I Comnenos, marriage apparently continued to be concluded without the benefit of ecclesiastical blessings but with its tolerance. Previous legislation had confined itself to the ecclesiastical form of the ceremony; by the decree of 1306 marriage was defined unequivocally as the responsibility of the parish priest. Presumably, Athanasios was affirming that the Church, in the person of the priest of the community, was the only legitimate agency to assure that the conditions necessary for a valid marriage existed. Any persons contracting a marriage without this approval and ceremony were to be fined by the fisc a sum equivalent to the dowry. Finally, following Byzantine canonical tradition, Athanasios in the *Neara* affirms that, except in cases where there were prohibiting factors and in cases of avowed celibacy, marriage was to be encouraged for all people¹⁹³.

Expanding several points in Athanasios' letters the longer recension of the *Neara* promulgates, for instance, feast days and Sundays as work-free days on which the faithful were to attend liturgical services and abstain from all festivities¹⁹⁴. In addition,

ὀφείλει τῷ δημοσίῳ ὅσον εὐρίσκεται καὶ ἡ προῖξ. The same injunction is repeated, without the authority of the *Neara*, in V = 226r (*Regestes*, 1777): ἱερέων γυναικῶν χωρῆς μὴ γίνεσθαι συνοικέσια. From the sixth to the ninth centuries imperial legislation continued to place more and more responsibilities for traditionally civil matters under the purview of the Church. In terms of marriage practices, the most significant changes occurred in the late ninth and early tenth centuries when Leo VI determined that all marriages between free citizens be accompanied by an ecclesiastical blessing. Alexius I expanded this to include slaves. See Novel 89 in NOAILLES and DAIN, *op. cit.*, 297: τὰ συνοικέσια τῆ μαρτυρία τῆς ἱερᾶς εὐλογίας ἐρῶσθαι κελεύομεν . . . The same Novel also determined that adoption was too serious a matter to be excluded from the purview of the Church and like marriage it had to be accomplished by an ecclesiastical blessing. For a discussion of marriage in the Byzantine Christian tradition, see JOHN MEYENDORFF, *Marriage: An Orthodox Perspective* (Tuckanhoe, N.Y.: St., Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1970), 91 - 99; and DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS, *Marriage, Sexuality, and Celibacy* (Minneapolis: Light and Life, 1935), 44-53.

193. V = 228v (*Regestes*, 1778): Leo VI made the same point when he decreed in this Novel 89 that «between marriage and celibacy there is no intermediate state which is irreproachable»; NOAILLES and DAIN, *op. cit.*, 297.

194. ZEPOS and ZEPOS, 535.

all of the faithful were obliged to observe all fast periods and especially the fast of Holy and Great Friday ¹⁹⁵.

With the obvious intention of eliminating temptation, the Nears enumerates regular weekly regulations for bath houses and taverns (βαλανείω ἢ καπηλείω), declaring that they be closed from the ninth hour (3 p.m.) on Saturday to the ninth hour on Sunday. On all other nights, citizens could make purchases in the taverns but could not drink there in company after sundown; hence, they were to be closed ¹⁹⁶. In February, 1306, just before the publication of the Nears, Athanasios in a letter to Andronicos made a similar point, perhaps with the intention of inspiring Andronicos' action:

Command therefore together with other good works that it be clearly proclaimed that at this time [Great Lent] no one should enter bath houses or taverns, but every Orthodox Christian should spend his time in the churches in contrition of spirit ¹⁹⁷.

A year after the publication of the Nears, Athanasios sent another letter to Andronicos urging the same principles concerning the holy fasts. In it he wrote more explicitly concerning Holy Week: all bath houses and taverns must be closed from Monday morning to Saturday morning; men, women, and children must be in church, and, rather than eat fish sold «by the old women at the seashore», they should instead eat boiled wheat, fruits, and vegetables ¹⁹⁸. Likewise, later in 1307 he asked Andronicos to close workshops (ἐργαστήριον) to conform to the same hours on Saturday and Sunday, with the obvious intention that the faithful have nothing to divert them from Vespers and Liturgy ¹⁹⁹. He felt that keeping these fasts

195. ZEPOS and ZEPOS, 536; also, V = 224v (*Regestes*, 1776).

196. ZEPOS and ZEPOS, 535; Athanasios' regulations are more rigorous than the tenth century *Book of the Prefect*, which determined that taverns must not open before 7 A.M. on Sunday (the second morning hour) and must close before 7 P.M. (the second evening hour); *Book of the Prefect*, XIX, 2 in ZEPOS and ZEPOS, II, 389.

197. V = 28v (TALBOT, 42; *Regestes*, 1646; dated February, 1306).

198. V = 29v (TALBOT, 43; *Regestes* 1663; dated Lent, 1307); eating fish during Lent was prohibited in Byzantine custom; see Balsamon's commentary on Canon 50 of the Council of Laodicea (RHALLS and POTLES, III, 217). I am assuming this regulation applied to Holy Week rather than all of Lent since the letter refers to the Biblical image of the bridegroom, commemorated during Holy week in the Byzantine Church.

199. V = 30r (TALBOT, 44, *Regestes*, 1665; dated Christmas, 1307); Novel 54 of Leo VI ordered that everyone refrain from work on Sunday; NOAILLES and ΔΑΪΝ, *op. cit.*, 205 - 7, In addition to these three services, Athanasios ex-

was serious enough an exercise to warrant the punishment of excommunication for those who did not abide by them ²⁰⁰.

The ultimate goal of all of Athanasios' reforms, and of the Neara in particular, is summed up in the closing paragraph which affirmed that all order is from God and must be maintained in His earthly commonwealth. The Byzantine Christian empire, since at least the time of Eusebios of Caesarea, was understood as a terrestrial copy of the heavenly archetype. Athanasios' passion for right order in the Christian world, of which the Neara was but one small expression, was based precisely on this identification.

Andronicos' Support of Athanasios' Reforms

Andronicos' character seems to have been deeply religious, even superstitious. His religious sensitivities are well demonstrated by his concern for the material well-being of the churches and monasteries ²⁰¹, the extent of his participation in liturgical services and processions ²⁰², and his special devotion to the Theotokos ²⁰³. His pious predisposition should have compelled him to act on the many requests of Athanasios, but it did not. Was he simply unable to conform to the pattern of rulership which Athanasios had established for him? Certainly, Athanasios' often bitter complaints of the failure of imperial response would support such a conclusion. His letters and memoranda were not answered and he even suggested that Andronicos was throwing them out the window ²⁰⁴; he had to make numerous petitions:

horted the faithful to also attend services for the dead $\mu\upsilon\tau\tau\mu\acute{o}\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha$); V = 225v (*Regestes*, 1777); and V = 224v (*Regestes*, 1776).

200. V = 224v (*Regestes*, 1776).

201. A. HEISENBERG, *Aus der Geschichte und Literatur der Palaiologenzeit* (Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1920), 85; NICOL, *op. cit.*, 46; V = 44v (TALBOT, 66; *Regestes*, 1709).

202. V = 52v (TALBOT, 71; *Regestes*, 1711); Athanasios referred to Andronicos as $\Phi\iota\lambda\epsilon\delta\rho\tau\omicron$.

203. PACHYMERES, II, 231, 255. Novel 39 extended the celebration of the Dormition to the entire month of August; see NICEPHOROS CHOUMNOS in BOISSONADE, *Anecdota Graeca* II (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962), 107 - 137; also in *Jus Graecoromanum*, I, 568 - 579. For a discussion of the act, see V. GRUMEL, «Le mois de Marie des Byzantins», *Échos d'Orient* XXXI (1932), 257 - 269. Grumel dates the act somewhere between 1294 and 1309.

204. V = 35r (TALBOT, 49; *Regestes*, 1695).

Since I take pity on those who have fallen <into misfortune>, I am compelled to make petitions especially about those problems which are beyond my power, but are easy, and indeed obligatory, for an emperor ²⁰⁵.

In another place, he complained that Andronicos answered some of his petitions, but ignored the important ones ²⁰⁶. Even his messengers were unwilling to go to the emperor because they were kept waiting and then greeted with silence ²⁰⁷. Athanasios informed him that he had managed to submit only a few cases out of thousands (ἐκ τῶν μυρίων ὀλίγα προαγόμενοι ἀναφέρειν) ²⁰⁸.

Athanasios assured Andronicos that he did not make these petitions out of self-interest, and was not courting imperial favor ²⁰⁹. Finally, admitting that Andronicos might be justifiably discontent with his meddling, the patriarch demanded that his petitions be answered not for his own sake, but for that of the Church (ἀλλὰ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πάρεχε τὴν τιμὴν), so God would strengthen the Roman Empire ²¹⁰. Believing his motives to be pure and without regard for personal gain, the prophetic reformer could only take it ill that his petitions were not answered. Furthermore, knowing that for a large part of his two tenures a significant number of enemies spoke against him around the throne, Athanasios seems justifiably paranoid and melancholic in his expressions.

In addition to not responding to his letters, the emperor often refused to meet with him. Filled with self-pity, Athanasios wrote:

And why have I endured to go hither and yon in the hope that I might have a chance to be heard properly by your divine majesty - even though I have never gained <such an appointment> - concerning the total destruction which has befallen the Roman people on account of our lawlessness ²¹¹

Instead of gaining access to the emperor and discussing affairs directly, Athanasios was forced to use messengers, who, even if they were honest, should not know what is passed between the pa-

205. V = 78r (TALBOT, 99; *Regestes*, 1726).

206. V = 58v (TALBOT, 80; *Regestes*, 1715).

207. V = 78r (TALBOT, 99; *Regestes*, 1726).

208. V = 78r (TALBOT, 99; *Regestes*, 1726).

209. V = 38v (TALBOT, 58; *Regestes*, 1702).

210. V = 40v (TALBOT, 60; *Regestes*, 1654).

211. V = 7v (TALBOT, 14; *Regestes*, 1677); see BANESCU, *op. cit.*, 35, and LAURENT «Le Serment», 129.

triarch and the emperor, «lest there seem to be disagreement between myself and your majesty»²¹². Athanasios seems to have sensed a growing tension in this use of messengers and feared that many of his enemies would seize upon it as an occasion to stir up more trouble for him²¹³.

As a result both of his own sense of importance and the difficulty of seeing Andronicos, Athanasios took up occasional residence at the Monastery of Chora, near the Blachernae palace. As early as 1304 - 1305, he called the bishops to meet there before going on to an audience with Andronicos at the palace²¹⁴. Nevertheless, he was still not permitted an audience as often as he desired:

After spending six days at Chora, as on another occasion ten days, and another time seven or eight, taking no heed of my trouble or hardships of winter because of my hopes, I returned empty-handed, my face filled with shame and embarrassment and tears²¹⁵.

Since none, or at best few, of these letters of complaint can be dated, it is difficult to trace a degeneration in the amicable relationship which Pachymeres has described between Athanasios and Andronicos. The letters most likely date from the latter part of his second patriarchate. The patriarch, with his incessant petitioning and his fierce sense of justice and righteousness, probably soon made himself a nuisance to an emperor ill-prepared to act on the innumerable social and ecclesiastical problems which were ruining his empire.

In one letter Athanasios admitted to Andronicos that his interference in the affairs of the empire could annoy the emperor; nonetheless, he told Andronicos that he was under a moral obligation to interfere and that this obligation was the reason for his own

212. V = 12r (TALBOT, 24; *Regestes*, 1623).

213. V = 12r - 12v (TALBOT, 24; *Regestes*, 1623). In the same letter he objects to the use of intermediaries because of the sensitivity of the matters being dealt with and the fear that their use would imply disagreement between them.

214. V = 12v (TALBOT, 23; *Regestes*, 1621). The Monastery of Chora is identified with the Kariye Djami which was restored in the early part of the fourteenth century by Theodore Metochites. The monastery church still exists today and considerable attention has been given to its study and restoration; see PAUL A. UNDERWOOD, *The Kariye Djami*, I (New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1966), 3. See also RAYMOND JANIN, *La géographie*, 537, 545 - 553.

215. V = 8r (TALBOT, 14; *Regestes*, 1677).

anger: «Philanthropy and mercy towards the needy are not a mere matter of choice, but rather a necessity and indispensable obligation;» ²¹⁶ and elsewhere, «If on occasion I appear to make petitions in a shameless manner, it is because of my desire for your glory in both worlds» ²¹⁷. Athanasios' predicament was simple, «I can neither keep silent nor speak» ²¹⁸. Given the fate of the Old Testament prophets, Andronicos probably found an omnipresent righteous conscience somewhat of a strain, tired of the patriarch's endless petitions, and responded by ignoring his letters and refusing to meet with him.

Athanasios' Second Resignation

Eventually because of Athanasios' rigorous social and ecclesiastical reforms, a significant number of clergy again broke from the communion of the patriarch, creating another schism ²¹⁹. His behavior, characterized by his contemporaries as too rigorous and uncanonical ²²⁰, eventually brought about his almost total isolation from all groups in Constantinople. In the latter part of 1309, after some six years of unrestrained reform efforts, the discontent of the clergy, both high and low, and of government functionaries peaked ²²¹. Nonetheless, the devotion of the emperor lingered on, and he took no action against the pious patriarch. To overcome Andronicos' inertia, Athanasios' enemies conjured up calumnies, accusing him of tolerating simony by failing to act against one of his subordinates, Theophanes, who had been discovered taking money in exchange for an ecclesiastical office. The charge of patriarchal collusion seems empty, especially since Athanasios actually wrote a letter to Andronicos making the same charge against Theophanes and urging civil action against him ²²². Several years later one of his enemies, Nicephoros Choumnos, in his «*Ἐλεγχος*»,

216. V = 78r (TALBOT, 99; *Regestes*, 1726): εἰ δὲ μὴ αἴρεσις ἢ φιλανθρωπία καὶ σπλάγγνα τοῖς χρήζουσιν ἀνοιγόμενα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀνάγκη καὶ ἀπαραίτητον ὄφλημα . . .

217. V = 38v (TALBOT, 58; *Regestes*, 1702).

218. V = 78r (TALBOT, 99; *Regestes*, 1726).

219. PACHYMERES, II, 384.

220. PACHYMERES, II, 617.

221. See LAURENT, «*La Chronologie*», 148. The figure of seven years and two months given by Theoktistos (TVA, 71) is too long.

222. V = 44v (TALBOT, 65; *Regestes*, 1708).

stated the case clearly. In the course of attacking Athanasios' successor, the Patriarch Niphon (1310 - 1314). Choumnos mentions that Athanasios had been deposed by a synod for the same charge now levelled against Niphon - simony. Choumnos' attack explains that this affair provoked the bishops and clergy to separate themselves from Athanasios: «With all the votes [of the synod] we deposed the patriarch»²²³. There is no support for Choumnos' implication of Athanasios, nor for his contention that Athanasios was officially expelled by a synod of bishops. Nonetheless, feelings ran high against the patriarch, and bishops did separate themselves from his communion.

Athanasios' enemies were eager to be rid of him, and several attempted to have him convicted of impiety, iconoclasm, and lèse majesté. They placed under Athanasios' footstool a picture of Christ and the emperor Andronicos with a bridle in his mouth, being led by the patriarch. When the stool was exposed and the picture brought to the emperor's attention, Andronicos dismissed the affair and on discovering the calumniators had them imprisoned²²⁴. Probably with this incident in mind, Athanasios reported in his second letter of resignation that some of his enemies had charged him with iconoclasm²²⁵. Both Athanasios' correspondence and his *vitae* attest to the fact that he resigned out of sorrow and despair. There was never a question of deposition; if there had been, Andronicos could have used the occasion of Theophanes' crime or the footstool incident to rid himself of the noisome patriarch²²⁶.

Athanasios was tired, ill, and emotionally unable to tolerate the hostility surrounding him. In an apologia, which he wrote after his retirement, he complained that everyone ignored him, except

223. NICEPHOROS CHOUMNOS, «Ἐλεγχος κατὰ τοῦ κακῶς τὰ πάντα πατρι-
αρχεύσαντος Νίφωνος», in *Anecdota Graeca*, V, 255 - 288, especially 259 - 260.
LAURENT, «Crises», 284, affirms that Athanasios lost his throne because of
Theophanes.

224. GREGORAS, I, 258 - 259; KVA, 102, reports that the images were of
wax.

225. V = 85v (TALBOT, 112; *Regestes*, 1666): KVA, 105; TVA, 70.

226. TVA, 70; Theoktistos insists that Andronicos tried to convince Athanasios to remain in office. KVA, 103, makes no mention of the conflict between Athanasios and the emperor or of Athanasios' complaint that he had no support from the emperor. V = 85v (TALBOT, 112; *Regestes*, 1666).

the Arsenites, who continually showered him with abuses²²⁷. Even Andronicos seemed eager to accept his stepping down; Andronicos, under pressure to unite the empire against the overwhelming threat of the Turks in Anatolia and to restore ecclesiastical peace by reconciling the Arsenites, seemed eager to accept Athanasios' resignation. It came in September, 1309, and on May 9, 1310, his successor, Niphon, was elected. Shortly afterwards the Arsenites returned to the communion of the official Church²²⁸.

Athanasios retired to his monastery at Xerolophos, where he lived quietly, performing miracles, seeing visions, which he communicated to the emperor, and teaching his disciples «holy practices» (ἀσκήσεως)²²⁹. One of the first things he did was to direct a letter to Andronicos as an apologia of his actions during his two patriarchates²³⁰. The document, which summarized his problems as patriarch, was much less restrained in its hostility than his second letter of resignation and blamed Andronicos for being absent from the city and for failing to support his reform efforts during his first patriarchate. He asserted that he sought to rule and guide not only the Church but the entire empire, which he identified with the patrimony of Christ:

Therefore since I had no one to help me guide the patrimony of Christ (τὴν κληρονομίαν ἰθύνειν Χριστοῦ) in accordance with the commandments and the precepts of the Gospels and the laws, still to the best of my ability . . . I did not hesitate to compel laymen, priests and bishops, and monks <to live> in a manner which I thought pleasing to God²³¹.

Athanasios, with full prophetic self-confidence, reported that he had a duty to correct the people and that in so doing he acted in accordance with the pleasure of God and the «evangelical and canonical <way of life> which was abused for a long time by laymen

227. V = 88v (TALBOT, 115; *Regestes*, Appendix 11); cf. LAURENT, «Crises», 290, notes 1 and 6.

228. GRUMEL, «La date de l'avènement du patriarche de Constantinople Niphon 1er», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XIII (1955), 138 - 139. The date of Athanasios' death is not known for certain, but is estimated to have a *terminus ante quem* of 1323. For discussion of the patriarch's life span, see TALBOT, *op. cit.*, xvi, note 7.

229. GREGORAS, I, 258 - 259.

230. V = 87v - 89r (TALBOT, 115; *Regestes*, Appendix 11).

231. V = 87v (TALBOT, 115; *Regestes*, Appendix 11).

and monks and the entire congregation of the Church»²³². Summarizing a fundamentally prophetic outlook, he warned Andronicos that because of the errors of «the chosen people» the empire was delivered into a slavery from which no human effort could save it²³³. Contrary to his second letter of resignation he affirmed that he was forced out, not by the canons, but by the secular authority and evil machinations:

As God is my witness, this is the plot and the story of my first and second resignations, even if the charges were different and of unequal weight since the bishops are ordered to prevent me from publicly celebrating the mass [*sic*] or from giving a blessing or from teaching anyone²³⁴.

It is obvious that Athanasios felt that Andronicos did not keep the oath of the promissory letter of 1303; however, what he meant when he wrote that he was forbidden to celebrate the liturgy or that he was forced out by the civil authority is a mystery. This apologia is composed primarily of the notes of a man melancholic and tired from a long struggle, characteristics not unknown to the prophets of the Old Testament in the face of perversity.

232. V = 87v - 88r (TALBOT, 115; *Regestes*, Appendix 11).

233. V = 88r (TALBOT, 115; *Regestes*, Appendix 11).

234. V = 89r (TALBOT, 115; *Regestes*, Appendix 11). The term «Mass» is an inappropriate and dated expression, the precise origin of which is uncertain. A more appropriate rendering of τοῦ εὐχέλθου is «liturgy» or «holy services».

Chapter IV

ATHANASIOS AND THE REFORM OF EPISCOPAL ABUSES

Ecclesiastical Dislocation

The affairs of the empire and the Church of Constantinople were severely affected by the political and geographical dislocation of Byzantine Anatolia. The boundaries between the empire at Nicea and the old Seljuk sultanate of Konya remained relatively stable; peace was assured between the two powers primarily as a result of a *modus vivendi* and the success of the Lascarids in holding off the Turkish threat militarily¹. The Lascarids were justly popular among the Christians of Asia Minor; they were primarily responsible for the prosperity and security of the area, especially in the western provinces where monastic and ecclesiastic institutions flourished through their numerous gifts, and maintained defenses and the defending march troops, the *akritai*².

This peace and stability was short-lived. In 1243 the Seljuk sultanate fell to the Mongols, and the numerous Turkish tribes from Asia were pushed westward by Mongol advances³. After the re-

1. For details of the respective borders of the Byzantines and Turks before 1261, see VRYONIS, *op. cit.*, 132 - 133. Cf. PAUL LEMERLE, *L'Émirat*, 20; at the beginning of the fourteenth century, we find two Christian Kingdoms in Anatolia, Trebizond and Little Armenia (Cilicia), at the Northeast and Southeast corners, respectively. The Byzantines retained in the Northwest corner, in the cities of Philadelphia, Brusa, Nicea, Nicomedia, and the districts located within a narrow strip of land along the Hellespont, the Sea of Marmora, and the Bosphorus. See HENRY ADAMS GIBBONS, *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire* (London: FRANK CASS and Co., Ltd., 1968, second edition), 13.

2. VRYONIS, *op. cit.*, 136; Michael VIII abandoned the *akritai* and even abolished their immunities from taxation. GREGORAS, I, 138, writes that the *akritai* under Michael drifted away from Byzantine obedience.

3. GREGORAS, I, 133; The Mongols never settled in Asia Minor and were headquartered in Armenia. WILLIAM LANGER and ROBERT BLAKE, «The Rise of the Ottoman Turks», *American Historical Review*, XXXVII (1932), 486.

conquest of Constantinople in 1261, the Palaeologi allowed the defenses of Anatolia to weaken, both through lack of interest in the area and insufficient resources¹. By 1300 almost all Asia Minor had fallen to the Turks, with the exception of a few fortified cities and ports which stood out like islands in a Turkish countryside. Trade and political stability were almost totally disrupted.

With the collapse of the Seljuk state and the weakening of Byzantine defenses, many competing Turkish emirates and beyliks tried to take over the Anatolian territory. Osman, the founder of the Osmanli (Ottoman) dynasty, occupied Bithynia², opposite Constantinople; from this strategic base the Osmalis became the single most significant threat to the empire³. Early in the fourteenth century the Osmanlis were, however, too insignificant as a separate group to invite the special attention of contemporary Byzantine historians. This new Turkish invasion, constituted as it was of numerous and small tribes, was difficult to control or evaluate

4. HÉLÈNE ARWEILLER, «L'histoire et la géographie de la région de Smyrne entre les deux occupations turques (1081 - 1317), particulièrement au XIII^e siècle», *Tavaux et Mémoires*, I (Paris: Éditions E. DE BOCCARD, 1965), 3 - 5.

5. CLEMENT HUART, «Le origines de l'Empire ottoman», *Journal des Savants*, XV (1917), 157; Othman was pronounced Osman by Persians and Turks. LANGER and BLAKE, *op. cit.*, 473. The Arab writer Shihab ad-Din al-Umari in 1340 wrote a huge geography and history covering the Mediterranean world and detailing conditions in Asia Minor. He made no reference to Osmanli presence; AL-UMARI, *Masalek Alabsar fi memalek alamsar (Voyages des yeux dans les royaumes des différentes contrées)* translated by M. QUATREMERE in *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits*, XIII (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1838), 151 - 384. Also see C. DEFREMERY et B.R. SANGUINETTI, (eds.), *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, II, Arabic text with French translation (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1914); similarly nothing in the descriptive work of Ibn Batoutah is written of the Ottomans. GIBBONS, *op. cit.*, relied on al-Umari's and Ibn Batoutah's accounts of their travels. Gibbon stresses primarily the importance of Byzantium in determining the westward direction of the Osmanli expansion. LANGER and BLAKE, *op. cit.*, 474, present the same explanation for Osmanli expansion into Europe, rather than south and east where there were relatively strong emirates. The earliest Osmanli historians date from the end of the fifteenth century; GIBBONS, *op. cit.*, 18.

6. PACHYMERES, II, 388 - 389; Pachymeres records garbled versions of Turkish names and inaccurately attempts to locate them in Anatolia. See MUNTANER, *ccii*, who reports that the Turks would have seized Constantinople had they had ships.

Wittek, in a work devoted to the growth of the principality of Mentеше in Caria, illuminates this movement into the maritime regions of Western Anatolia and provides a penetrating picture of the new Turkish immigrants ⁷. The emperor occasionally attempted to stop the Turks and drive them out, but they were beginning to make themselves at home as the Byzantine population either fled to the rule of Constantinople or remained but with little loyalty. Andronicos' trip to Asia Minor during the last decade of the thirteenth century seemed designed to win them back and so rally the defenses of the area, but each military effort under Andronicos and Michael IX seemed doomed to failure and the situation deteriorated progressively.

In Bithynia, in the summer of 1302, the Osmanlis defeated Michael IX in the Battle of Bapheus. Afterwards, many of the inhabitants who survived the battle and the ensuing onslaught and massacre left their homes and fled to Constantinople and the islands of the Propontis ⁸. Confidence in the central government, already weak, was radically shaken. All that was left in Asia Minor were the fortified cities - Nicomedia, Brusa, Nicea - crowded with refugees. Pachymeres describes the conditions in Anatolia:

The situation in the east declined and grew worse so that daily worse and worse reports came to the emperor . . . There was between us and the enemies only the narrow sea. The enemies attacked without restraint, destroying all the lands, the most beautiful churches and monasteries, and some of the fortresses, and they burned the most beautiful of these. They revelled daily in murdering and in dreadful enslavement such as had never been heard of ⁹.

After the defeat of Bapheus, Michael retreated to Pegae, and Osman laid waste the whole of Bithynia from Nicomedia to Lapadriion and the suburbs of Constantinople on the Asian shore ¹⁰. After this battle nothing official is heard of Osman until 1308 ¹¹.

7. P. WITTEK, *Das Fürstentum Mentеше. Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13. - 15. Jahrhundert* (Istanbul: Abteilung Istanbul des archäologischen Institutes des Deutschen Reiches, 1934).

8. PACHYMERES, II, 327, 334 - 335, 344.

9. PACHYMERES, II, 338.

10. PACHYMERES, II, 335.

11. PACHYMERES, II, 597 - 599; GIBBONS, *op. cit.*, 45.

The leading cities of Bithynia resisted Turkish attacks for another two decades with Brusa falling in 1326 Nicea in 1331 and Nicomedia in 1337. Each conquest was accompanied by violent displacements of both rural and urban populations and the collapse of what had been highly structured military, civil, and ecclesiastical affairs. Anarchy prevailed, nullifying all efforts at regaining the advantage against the seemingly undefeatable Turks; even the little opposition that those remaining loyal might have provided had no natural rallying point since many of the civil and ecclesiastical officials had fled to the relative security of Constantinople. Nothing on such a catastrophic scale had ever struck the patriarchate of Constantinople before. The prime goal of Athanasios' ecclesiastical reforms was to reorder the episcopal hierarchy and send the displaced bishops back to their proper dioceses, where they would serve as defenders of the faith and, as a corollary, leaders of the people surrounded by a hostile element.

It is virtually impossible to determine exact population figures for the period and the number of people dislocated. Nevertheless, we can assume that there had been a large and stable Orthodox population in Anatolia¹² since a large number of bishoprics covered the territory, and by canon law a bishopric could exist only in a city of a certain population (πολύάνθρωποι)¹³. We can in no way understand the history of the Church in this period or the account of Athanasios' activities without assuming a substantial shift in population of what had been numerically the strongest part of the Church.

Anatolia had had an elaborate ecclesiastical organization of metropolitanates, archbishoprics, and bishoprics, all of which were

12. VRYONIS, *op. cit.*, 25. Population estimates for Anatolia during this period average around six million.

13. Cf. *Ibid.*, 27 for discussion of this population requirement for establishment of an episcopal see. What is clear is that a large and stable population was necessary. Canon 57 of Laodicea prescribes πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων for the appointment of a bishop; (see RHALLES and POTLES, III, 222 - 223, commented on by Balsamon). The Council of Chalcedon in 451 decreed that only cities could be the seats of bishoprics. Later the words «bishopric» and «city» became interchangeable; on this see HEINRICH GELZER, «Undruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatum», *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Abhandlungen der philosophisch - philologischen Klass.* Band. 21 (1901), 546.

subordinate to the See of Constantinople. After the disasters beginning late in the eleventh century and continuing until the period under consideration, the domains under obedience to the patriarchate became subject to the same dismemberment as imperial territory. The poor financial condition of the empire was not due simply to Andronicos' mismanagement or his father's reckless expenditures, but largely to the loss of the income-producing areas of Asia Minor. This also explains the poverty-stricken state of the ecumenical patriarchate itself; the Church of Constantinople lost not only its patrimony but also its income from dioceses in Asia Minor which had supported many of its ecclesiastical and social functions.

The structure of the Church which grew up in Anatolia was elaborate, and all ecclesiastical institutions, whether diocesan, monastic, or charitable were supported by extensive holdings and incomes¹⁴. These incomes also maintained the bishops as comfortable, even wealthy, ecclesiastical landlords. When Anatolia began to collapse under the Turkish onslaught, the bishops quite naturally fled to Constantinople. Whatever their excuses, these foot-loose bishops raised the reforming ire of Athanasios, who not only rejected every excuse but tirelessly condemned their lifestyle and maneuverings in the capital¹⁵.

The Council in Trullo had been relatively lenient when in the seventh century it ordered all bishops to return to their proper sees once the danger from «barbarians» had been removed and it was no longer necessary to seek refuge in Constantinople¹⁶. The noted canonist, Balsamon, discussing the same problem in the context of the conditions of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, accepted the legality of the consecration of all bishops who had been validly

14. VRYONIS, *op. cit.*, 34; by the early tenth century there were 371 episcopal sees in Anatolia and 99 in Europe, reflecting the importance of the area to both the Church and the empire; see *ibid.*, 35.

15. V = 13v - 14r (TALBOT, 30; *Regestes*, 1598). V = 32v - 33r (TALBOT, 48; *Regestes*, 1694). V = 41v - 42r (TALBOT, 61; *Regestes*, 1704). V = 42v - 43r (TALBOT, 62; *Regestes*, 1705).

16. Canon 37 (RHALLÉS and POTLES, II, 388). The canon refers to bishops who have been elected and consecrated, but are unable to assume their seats because of «barbarian» occupation. He is allowed all the dignities and rights of the office even though not resident in his assigned diocese.

elected but could not get to their dioceses. These bishops, however, might not teach or ordain without the consent of the bishop of the city in which they had sought refuge¹⁷. Therefore, the conditions which Athanasios faced were not new, except in the extent and permanency of the ecclesiastical disruption.

In the late medieval period the Orthodox Church had responded to these anomalous political conditions by permitting a bishop to be translated from a diocese which could no longer support him to one which could. Such transfers were generally referred to by such terms as *μετακλήσις*, *μετάθεσις* or *μετάβασις*, and usually designated a simple translation of a bishop to an episcopal see of the same or inferior rank¹⁸. If for any reason, such as a «barbarian» invasion, a bishop could not get to his assigned see and could not function in the capacity to which he had been elected, he was then considered as «unattached» or *σχολλάζων*¹⁹, a category which naturally grew as the empire's territory decreased.

The term *σχολλάζων* began to appear in ecclesiastical literature well before the period being studied, but during this period especially all documents imply that the *σχολλάζοντες* were the bishops who were unable to go to the church to which they had been elected either because of the danger of travel or because the diocese had been occupied by foreigners who would not allow Orthodox bishops to assume their charges²⁰. Theoleptos, Metropolitan of Philadelphia, for example, was unable, though certainly willing,

17. Balsamon, commenting on Canon 37 of the Council in Trullo, refers to the Novel 23 of Alexios Comnenos. The bishops of the Anatolian sees were allowed to keep their incomes from them until they were able to return when conditions improved; (RHALLÉS and POTLES, II, 390 - 391). In another place, RHALLÉS and POTLES, III, 274 - 275, Balsamon, commenting on Canon 17 of the Council of Sardica quoted a twelfth - century novel of Manuel I Comnenos on the subject: «Thus let it be noted, that the Anatolian bishops who do not have seats because their churches are held by foreigners are not to be ejected from the Queen of Cities». Canon 18 of the Council in Trullo (RHALLÉS and POTLES, II, 379) established the same privileges for priests.

18. For instances of such transfers, see LAURENT, *Regestes*, 1240, 1316, 1568.

19. S. SALAVILLE, «Le titre ecclésiastique de 'proedros' dans les documents byzantins», *Échos d'Orient*, XXXIX (1930), 423.

20. VRYONIS, *op. cit.*, 312, n131. This situation parallels the conditions of the *σχολλάζοντες* from the Balkans and Anatolia in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The Comnenoi distinguished between the two groups and

to return to his diocese. When he finally did manage to get back to his see, he led its defense against Turkish attacks in 1304 ²¹.

We can easily imagine that the Turkish conquerors had little desire to see an Orthodox bishop residing in a newly conquered city; the bishop was not only a natural rallying point for the indigenous population, but had direct ecclesiastical connections to Constantinople. In spite of the Turkish hostility towards local Christian leadership, Athanasios was in most cases adamant that the bishops in the capital were there illegally for the sake of safety, luxury, and trouble-making. They had to return; in cases in which they were physically unable to do so, the bishops might be granted the administration and income of vacant dioceses as a means of support. Such a diocese was, in principle, on temporary loan until the bishop could be restored to his own see. The bishop receiving custody of another diocese in addition to his own, received it *κατ' ἐπίδοσιν, κατὰ λόγον ἐπιδόσεως, or ἐπιδόσεως λόγον* ²², and was given the title of *proedros*, or administrator, of that diocese, with all of the rights except that of enthronement ²³. Salaville concludes that what made a bishop the bishop of a particular see was the enthronement ²⁴; hence, the use of the title of *proedros*

allowed the Anatolian bishops to remain in Constantinople, while compelling the Balkan bishops to return; (see RHALES and POTLES, III, 156).

21. V. LAURENT, «Une princesse byzantine au cloître», *Échos d'Orient*, XXIX (1930), 57, for a description of the difficulties Theoleptus faced in reaching his see. Gregoras I, 221. Illustrative of the general conditions which the bishops met at this period is the account of the Metropolitan Matthew of Ephesus. Matthew had managed to return to his see in 1339 where he suffered great disabilities and his cathedral church was turned into a market and a mosque, only six priests remaining in his diocese. After a few years the situation was so hopeless that he returned to Constantinople; MAXIMUS TREU, *Matthaios, Metropolitan von Ephesos: Über sein Leben und sein Schriften* (Potsdam: A.M. HAKKERT, 1901), 51 - 58; for discussion, see VRYONIS, *op. cit.*, 343 - 348.

22. SALAVILLE, «Titre», 424; «successive ou simultanée, cette occupation de deux ou plusieurs sièges n'en constituait pas moins, au regard des lois canoniques, une violation de l'indissoluble union que l'évêque contracte, au jour de sa consecration, avec l'église dont il devient le pasteur».

23. See *ibid.*, 430 - 431, for three examples to support this definition of *proedros*. Cf. MIKLOSICH et MÜLLER, *Acta et Diplomata Graeca medii aevi*, II (Vienna: C. GEROLD, 1860 - 1890), 209 and 390, for early fourteenth century examples of this usage. Salaville comments that prior to this period there was little uniformity in the use of the term; «Titre», 422 - 423.

24. *Ibid.*, 431.

was in keeping with Canons 37 and 39 of Trullo, which concerned prelates who were forced out of their sees by invasions and maintained the canonical fiction of the indissoluble union between the diocese and its bishop. The procedure occurred much more frequently than before and took the form of a benefice or grant to those bishops who fled or were expelled from Anatolia by the coming of the Turks; furthermore, it was a process of which Athanasios himself occasionally made use.

Andronicos formalized this ecclesiastical fiction in a conservative reaction to the military collapse in Asia Minor. In 1299 or 1300 Andronicos prepared a completely revised list of episcopal sees in the empire, the *Notitia Episcopatum*, which represented the structure of the Byzantine Church before the fall of Constantinople²⁵. The list accounted for one hundred and twelve metropolitan sees, almost evenly divided between the European and Anatolian provinces; thirteen of these were newly created. The real significance, as pointed out by one author, is not the conservatism which the list represents, but rather the small concessions to reality in the relative numbering of the sees, which gave priority to those in Europe²⁶. In addition to the new status granted the European sees, the creation of the metropolitan sees of Galicia and Lithuania in the territory of Kievan Russia represented the growing influence of the ecumenical patriarchate outside the empire²⁷.

Prior to Andronicos' *Notitia*, the last great effort to register the ecclesiastical organization of the Church was in the tenth century and no longer represented the actual facts. Andronicos' publication of his list at this time may well have been an effort to maintain in outline the essential structure of imperial and ecclesiastical administration in territory that had been lost to imperial control. There would thus be a potential administrative structure ready for the time when these territories were reconquered.

Athanasios used grants *κατὰ λόγον ἐπιδόσεως*, but resented

25. GELZER, *op. cit.*, 595 - 606 (= text of Andronicus' *ekthesis*); the text of the *Notitia Episcopatum* is preserved in several manuscripts and nomocanonical collections which are discussed in Gelzer (596 - 597). On earlier episcopal registers, see NICOL, *op. cit.*, 112. The only previous effort of any significance was that of Leo VI's.

26. GELZER, *op. cit.*, 597 - 601.

27. *Ibid.*, 599 n 81 and 600 n 83; cf also DÖLGER, *Regesten.*, 2270.

the emperor's granting of benefices within his own diocese of Constantinople. In order to provide an income for several of the leading bishops who were refugees in the capital, the emperor had granted them urban monasteries as residences and sources of subsistence. In several instances Athanasios was so angered by this violation of his canonical prerogative that he seized these houses from their tenants. Although the character of these takeovers is not clear, they were no doubt accomplished with the assent of Andronicos and in accord with canon law. In one place he attacked the installation of the Patriarch of Antioch, Cyril, in the Monastery of the Theotokos Hodegetrias ²⁸. On the other hand, he encouraged the Metropolitan of Crete, Nicephoros Moschopoulos, to accept a provincial diocese as a source of revenue (κατ' ἐπίδοσιν). Moschopoulos had fled Crete, which was occupied by the Venetians, and was unable to return. Instead of having him remain in Constantinople, he was offered the diocese of Lacedaemonia, which was accompanied by an annual income of two hundred nomismata to be derived from yet another but unnamed diocese, for which he would also be responsible ²⁹. Likewise, the bishop of Sardis, which was lost to the Turks, is reported to have returned to his «benefice», the diocese of Methymne on the Island of Lesbos ³⁰, and the bishop of Apamea left Constantinople during Athanasios' second patriarchate to govern the see of Nicomedia, which had been granted him κατ' ἐπίδοσιν on the death of the metropolitan, Karakalos.

The process of ridding Constantinople of foreign bishops was slow, but the patriarch seems on occasion to have demonstrated patience. For instance, he addressed four letters to the bishop of Apamea urging him back to the diocese he had assumed κατ' ἐπίδοσιν ³¹. With so many letters and such coaxing, there was obviously much more to Athanasios' personality than the much-publicized harshness.

28. V = 48r (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614). This was Cyril's residence since his arrival in Constantinople in 1288.

29. V = 131r (*Regestes*, 1627); A. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ - ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ, «Νικηφόρος Μοσχόπουλος», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* XII (1903), 215 - 223. Text of Athanasios' letter is included, 217 - 219.

30. V = 132v (*Regestes*, 1627).

31. V = 126r - 127r (*Regestes*, 1742); V = 127r - 128r (*Regestes*, 1743). V = 128v - 129v (*Regestes*, 1744); V = 129v - 130v (*Regestes*, 1746).

Athanasios' efforts to have the bishop of Apamea assume his responsibility is another side of his effort to get the bishops out of the city; if they could not be forced back to their own dioceses, for whatever reason, then they were encouraged to assume the administration of vacant sees as *proedros*. Unfortunately, the bishop of Apamea refused to settle a legal claim against him and so was prevented from leaving the city. Athanasios tried to persuade him to return goods described as unjustly seized, but the solution was not simple and the quarrel continued between the bishop and some unnamed adversaries. The patriarch, however, pointed out that, his case being very weak, a synodal tribunal would most certainly find against him ³². For Athanasios, the conflict seems to have been resolved, and he was able to write the bishop of Apamea informing him that he himself had already written to the people of Nicomedia that they would soon be receiving him as their shepherd ³³.

The Turkish successes sometimes forced the patriarch to accept the fact that some bishops could not return to the dioceses to which they had been elected either because of unsafe travel conditions or because the Turks would not allow Orthodox bishops to reside within cities they occupied. Granting benefices was then the only way of getting the bishops to leave the city. By this process of granting dioceses *κατ' ἐπίδοσιν*, Athanasios assured the proper governance of the diocese granted as a benefice, the subsistence of a bishop as *proedros*, and his own peace by ridding Constantinople of the nuisance of too many bishops.

Patriarch Athanasios of Alexandria, who had, along with a group of bishops, refused to accept Athanasios' retaking of the ecumenical throne in 1303, led the opposition to Athanasios' program. A virtual schism was in effect until most of the bishops, with the exception of Athanasios of Alexandria, agreed on Palm Sunday, 1304, to accept Athanasios as the bishop of Constantinople ³⁴.

32. V = 127r - 128r (*Regestes*, 1743); LAURENT, *Regestes*, 525 - 526, suggests that the goods here under discussion were usurped in Apamea during the confusion caused by the Turks. They must have eventually been returned since it is difficult to imagine that Athanasios would have allowed the bishop to proceed as *proedros* without such a settlement. See V = 128r - 129v (*Regestes*, 1744).

33. V = 129v - 139v (*Regestes*, 1746).

34. PACHYMERES, II, 409.

Besides the nuisance of so many bishops and the constant opposition to his reform efforts, Athanasios had to contend with what amounted to ecclesiastical pauperization as a result of the seizure of so much of the Church's income-producing property. In one case Athanasios was either unwilling or unable to meet regular salary obligations to the clergy of St. Sophia. But Vryonis, trying to place the quarrel between the bishops and Athanasios on an economic basis, confuses this salary issue and argues that the poverty of the bishops of Anatolia was reflected in their quarrel with Athanasios over their refusal to vest properly for services: «The basic causes of the quarrel between Athanasios and the metropolitans, which led to the patriarch's abdication in 1310 [sic], were economic»³⁵. To support his argument that they did not have funds to maintain themselves, Vryonis notes that *the metropolitans* had lost their income and their staff of officials as a result of the Turkish conquests and correctly quotes Pachymeres' description of their arriving in Constantinople in the basest condition of poverty³⁶. He goes on to say that in spite of this poverty Athanasios, assuming that they were merely willful in their refusal, insisted that they take part in all ecclesiastical services in full vestments. In reaching this conclusion, Vryonis misinterprets a section of Pachymeres which refers to Athanasios' conflict with οἱ δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρωτεύοντες, whom Vryonis mistakenly takes to be the metropolitans³⁷. The section actually refers not to the metropolitans, but to the clergy of St. Sophia, who had instituted a strike to achieve certain salary demands. The clergy of St. Sophia, and not the bishops in this case, were refusing to attend, on time and vested, the regular services of the Church. A group of Athanasios' letters describes the identical conflict, and thus reinforces Pachymeres' interpretation. Regardless of participants in this particular confrontation, ecclesiastical finances were extremely tight, so tight that Athanasios imposed an austerity administration on the Church of Constantinople not only from his monastic predisposition but also as a fin-

35. VRYONIS, *op. cit.*, 311.

36. PACHYMERES, II, 519.

37. For the complaints of the clergy of St. Sophia, see PACHYMERES, II, 644 - 645, which refers specifically to conditions concerning salary described by Athanasios in V = 215r - 216r (*Regestes*, 1768), and V = 216r - 217r (*Regestes*, 1769).

ancial necessity. Contrary to Vryonis' opinion, the basic disagreement between Athanasios and the metropolitans was based not on economics but on Athanasios' understanding of the conditions of the Church and the moral and disciplinary collapse which he saw about him.

The most serious overall effect of the Turkish conquest and settlement in Byzantine Anatolia was in the area of ecclesiastical discipline. These invasions were used as an excuse or as a justified occasion for the suspension of all normal canonical regulations. Hence, monks left their monasteries and roamed about Constantinople and other urban centers, living off wealthy families; likewise the bishops, used to comfortable living in urban areas and social prestige, found it convenient to establish themselves in the capital. But this lifestyle was not nearly so serious as their sense of independence from the jurisdiction of the Patriarch and their propensity to function as if they had carried their diocesan responsibilities to Constantinople where, there could be only one canonical bishop — Athanasios.

Episcopal Corruption

The large number of bishops in the capital naturally strained good ecclesiastical order. In numerous letters addressed both to the bishops and to Andronicos, Athanasios revealed their coming to the city as neither an act of personal safety nor as a means of serving the Church in synodal meetings, but as one of base gain and wanton luxury³⁸. The letters offer a view not only of a decaying empire, but of the low level of Byzantine ecclesiastical and clerical life, albeit from the somber perspective of a moralist.

In a sense, the loss of Asia Minor was an inevitable process which could only be delayed but not stopped. Athanasios refused to accept the ecclesiastical and spiritual chaos which this loss brought about and attempted in the face of an almost impossible situation to apply with full rigor canons which in earlier and similar situations had been modified in practice. He attempted to govern the Church as if everything were normal. In attacking the bishops, for example, Athanasios maintained his Old Testamental and prophetic approach. As the prophets had lamented for Israel,

38. V = 58r (TALBOT, 79, *Regestes*, 1643).

he wrote, so now they lament for the empire of the Orthodox. «Though far from Jerusalem, the prophet Hosea [6:9] speaks to us: 'the priests and the [civil] leaders are become like a net to entrap from their positions'»³⁹. He continued the attack on ecclesiastical and civil leaders with references to Micah and David, who warned that Israel could not be built on blood, nor must its leaders mingle with evil and unjust things. Joel also, he warned, spoke out against the sacrificial priesthood, which had led the holy nation of Israel astray⁴⁰. Again, he urged the bishops not to liken themselves to those of the sacrificial priests who said: «Blessed is the Lord and we have become rich». (Zechariah 11:5)⁴¹ In general, the book of Zechariah was an excellent example for Athanasios because sections are specifically devoted to Judah, God's beloved, as a flock without a shepherd (Zechariah 10:2 - 3); because of the sins and failures of the leaders, God had punished the nation. Likewise, Jeremiah, the prophet to whom the patriarch bears the greatest resemblance, lamented that the people were wretched, and because of their evil ways and their turning from the Lord, the flock would be scattered and the vineyard would become a desert. Athanasios wrote to the bishops:

We should become wise from the examples of the terrible things that happened to [the Old Testament priesthood].

The first lesson, he reminded them, is to care for the sheep of God «unto death» (μέχρις αἵματος)⁴². The prophetic mentality and the prophetic urgency represented by these parallels are the only manner in which to understand Athanasios' reform policies.

In a characteristically prophetic tone, Athanasios complained that through corrupt leadership the Byzantine polity had betrayed its essentially Christian nature and «God was also vexed and brought disasters against the people called by the name of Christ»⁴³. This

39. V= 134r (*Regestes*, 1747); while this is not a direct quote from Hosea, it is a paraphrase of several verses; see for instance HOSEA 10:5 and 6:9. Almost every reference to judgment and chastisement, including military losses and the shrinking of the nation, is verbatim from Hosea.

40. V= 134v (*Regestes*, 1747).

41. V= 135r (*Regestes*, 1747): καὶ οἱ πωλοῦντες κτῆσά, εὐλογητὸς κύριος καὶ πεπλουτήκαμεν ἔλεγον.

42. V= 134r, 136r (*Regestes*, 1747).

43. V= 1r - 1v (TALBOT, 1; *Regestes*, Appendix 3); the letter is dated by Laurent between April 1299 and October 1300, indicating again that Athan-

particular letter blamed the bishops for their part in the decline in the fortunes of the empire and tied it directly to the prophetic warning against the corruption of the sacrificial priesthood ⁴⁴.

In addition to criticizing the bishops, Athanasios criticized Andronicos as well, reminding him that two elements constitute the freedom of the Church, which the emperor had promised to protect: exemption from taxes and proper residence of the bishops ⁴⁵. Assuming that attention to these will restore order to the ecclesiastical and military life of the empire, Athanasios placed the full burden of enforcing episcopal residence on Andronicos. The patriarch assumed that attention to these matters would cure the empire of its ills. Joshua, he assured Andronicos, won his victory over the Amalekites because Moses had ordered the swift execution of the man who profaned the Sabbath by collecting wood (Exodus 17: 16 - 18) ⁴⁶. Not unexpectedly, he referred to Andronicos in several places as the «new Moses» ⁴⁷, who if he did not punish the bishops, would not defeat the Turks, whom he referred to as «Amalek» ⁴⁸.

Because the emperor had not fostered righteousness and enforced the canons, the nation had become geographically small:

Not being joined together by holy things we have become smaller than any nation and we are become nothing and humble on account of our unlawful deeds and especially today ⁴⁹.

Athanasios identified the shepherds with those who commit these misdeeds; instead of caring for their sheep, they consorted with whores, loved gifts, and did not care for widows and orphans as they were obliged.

asius was active during his retirement at Xerolophos. For discussion see BANESCU, *op. cit.*, 39 - 40, and GENADIOS, «Ἡ πρώτη ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου ἀποχώρησις τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἀθανασίου Α΄», *Orthodoxia*, XXVIII (1953), 145 - 150.

44. V = 63v (*Regestes*, 1716).

45. V = 49v - 50r C. TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614).

46. V = 43v (TALBOT, 62; *Regestes*, 1705); Old Testament references are used profusely since Byzantium is ὁ . . . νέος κληθεὶς Ἰσραήλ. See V = 272v.

47. V = 75v (TALBOT, 94; *Regestes*, 1608).

48. V = 43v (TALBOT, 62; *Regestes*, 1705): ἡ νίκη ἐκείνου τοῦ μουσαροῦ Ἀμαλήκ.

49. V = 63v (*Regestes*, 1716): ἐνθεν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν μὴ συναϊρομένου, ἐσμὶν κρύβημεν παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἐσμὲν ἐξουθενημένοι καὶ ταπεινοί, δι' ἀντέκτισιν παρανομῶν καὶ μάλιστα σήμερον.

The Synodos Endemousa

The permanent synod of Constantinople, or the *Synodos Endemousa*, appears in many of Athanasios' letters as the excuse proffered by many bishops for their coming to the capital. The function of this synod, which is unique both in the history of the Byzantine Church and the history of the Church in general, served both ecclesiastical and civil functions.

At an early date the bishop of Constantinople became the emperor's counselor on ecclesiastical affairs. Little by little an advisory council arose around him as an informal institution, which most historians consider to be «l'origine de la σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα»⁵⁰. The *Synodos Endemousa* was composed of bishops who were temporarily residing in the city and who as individuals in no sense constituted a permanent body. Stephanides, particularly, insists on the point that the membership consisted of those hierarchs who then resided in the city on certain business or were ἐνδημοῦντες⁵¹. The *Synodos Endemousa* developed parallel to the regular annual synod, which, according to Justinian's legislation, the patriarch had to call annually in either June or September⁵².

50. HIEROMOINE PIERRE, «Notes d'ecclésiologie orthodoxe», *Irénikon*, X (1933), 119; the date of the establishment of this synod is difficult to set with accuracy primarily due to the informal nature of its beginnings. R. JANIN, «Formation du patriarcat oecuménique de Constantinople», *Échos d'Orient*, XIII (1910), 214, writes: «L'histoire des ses origines reste enveloppée de ténèbres». JOSEPH HAJJAR, «Le synode permanent dans l'Église byzantine des origines au XIe siècle», *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 164 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1962), 21 - 43; Hajjar dates its regular appearance from the fifth century.

51. B.K. STEPHANIDES, Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικὸν δίκαιον (Constantinople, 1921), quoted in HAJJAR, *op. cit.*, 19. SIMÉON VAILÉ, «Le droite d'appel en orient et le Synod permanent de Constantinople», *Échos d'Orient*, XXIV (1921), 137, writes: «Ces sejours à Constantinople devirrent même si fréquents ou si prolongés que, parfois, on compta jusqu' à soixante évêques renuus dans la capital . . . »

52. HAJJAR, *op. cit.*, 19, points out that this conclusion is the genuine originality of Stephanides' work. Early ecclesiastical legislation specified that provincial synods meet two times per year; Canon 5 of I Nicea (RHALLÉS and POTLES, II, 124 - 125) and Canon 37 of the Apostolic Canons (RHALLÉS and POTLES, II, 50). In the seventh century it was determined that at least one synod per year must be held in each province; Canon 8 of the Council in Trullo (RHALLÉS and POTLES, II, 324 - 325). For civil legislation, les Novel 137 of Justinian and the Basilics III, I, 17.

The significant switch from a «provincial» synod of bishops to a «patriarchal» synod of metropolitans is an important canonical development peculiar to Constantinople. The annual synod, composed of hierarchs ordained by the patriarch and owing him ecclesiastical obedience, was still a practice during Andronicos' reign. Athanasius wrote in one letter that the law ordains that once each year the bishops of the patriarchate leave their own dioceses and come to Constantinople for a council, yet he complained that this canonical requirement had become the occasion for the bishops to pursue human gain, rather than the honor and advancement of the Church and the protection of her doctrine and discipline⁵³. Although he accepted the fact of his own bishops' coming to Constantinople for the annual synod, he immediately added that they must actually do the work of the assembly and assist at all services, especially on feast days, except in the case of sickness. Many of the bishops were simply using the annual synod as an excuse to come to the capital and take care of their commercial and social affairs, not bothering even to return to their dioceses at the end of synodal business. In writing of the annual synod (ἐκλότῳ ἐνιαυτῷ), he ordered that the bishops must leave after a short stay and not linger on⁵⁴.

The precise activity of the *Synodos Endemousa* and the limits of its competence were never clearly defined in canonical or imperial legislation⁵⁵, but as the viability of the Byzantine bureaucratic institutions declined, many traditionally secular or civil functions were transferred to the competence of the patriarchate. From many of Athanasios' letters, particularly those complaining about the corruption of the bishops in rendering justice, it is clear that the synod acted as a court in civil matters. The *Neara* or *Novel*, issued by Athanasios and the synod in 1304 as canonical legislation and reissued as imperial law in 1306, dealt with civil and moral matters relating to marriage, testation, punishment of moral offenses, and

53. V = 121r (*Regestes*, 1739).

54. V = 121v (*Regestes*, 1739); there is a heavy emphasis in all Athanasios' letters on liturgical participation while the bishops remained in the city.

55. On the limits of the synods, see HAJJAR, *op. cit.*, 10; on civil powers, see *ibid.*, 115. On geographical limits Hajjar has written: «Le synode ne connaissait d'autre limites territoriales à sa compétence que celle des frontières de l'empire byzantine».

so on. This outstanding compilation of legislation on civil matters illustrates the extent of ecclesiastical involvement in judicial functions⁵⁶.

Lemerle, who has studied the tribunal and its functioning between 1315 and 1402 in terms of its competence in secular affairs, records that approximately thirty cases were heard between 1315 and 1330, and approximately sixty between 1399 and 1401. He reasons that the number of hearings increased dramatically because the imperial government, in spite of the judicial reforms of Andronicos, was unable to handle all judicial questions. This increase in the authority of the synod demonstrates the increase in the Church's power and the corresponding decrease in the imperial government's. Lemerle concludes that the turning point in this process of judicial transfer from secular to ecclesiastical courts can be traced to Athanasios: «Je crois que les initiatives hardies du Patriarche Athanase Ier ne sont pas étrangères au nouvel état de chose. . . .»⁵⁷

During Athanasios' second patriarchate, 1303 through 1309, the judicial foundations of the synod were effectively established. The permanent synod played, at least during the patriarch's second tenure, the role of a tribunal to which all citizens could bring their complaints against alleged injustices. In short, Athanasios used the *Synodos Endemousa* as a vehicle for his reforms. Athanasios' letters attest to the judicial and appellate functions fulfilled by the synod. Although the Church traditionally had jurisdiction over questions involving marriage, he wrote the emperor in one place concerning a couple who had requested a divorce; the bishops could not reach a decision since the testimonies of the witnesses were confused and contradictory⁵⁸. It was customary in such cases to threaten excommunication for false testimony, but Athanasios' response is indicative of a gentler aspect of his personality. Informing the emperor that he wanted to avoid such a radical approach,

56. V = 50v - 52r (*Regestes*, 1607). On the *Neara*, see supra 72-82.

57. PAUL LEMERLE, «Recherches sur les institutions judiciaires à l'époque des Paléologues, II: Le tribunal patriarcal ou synodal». *Analecta Bollandiana*, LXVIII (1950) (= MELANGES P. PEETERS II), 320. See also, IHOR ŠEVČENKO, «Léon Bardales et les juges généraux, ou la corruption des incorruptibles», *Byzantion*, XIX (1949), 247 - 259.

58. V = 11v (TALBOT, 21; *Regestes*, 1682).

«to save them from such ruin», he asked the emperor simply to dissolve the marriage outside of the court without requiring either party to pay damages ⁵⁹.

On at least three other occasions we see the Endemousan Synod considering secular suits - these involving corrupt officials. In the first, Athanasios wrote to the Grand Diocete, whom the synod had condemned for some dishonest transaction. He warned him to stop protesting his sentence since his punishment was less than he deserved, and further warned that if he continued, the bishops would fine him severely enough to cast him into the depths of poverty experienced by his unfortunate victims ⁶⁰. In another instance, a call was issued in January, 1304, to the bishops and the clergy to meet in session and to judge the Despot Michael on suspicion of high treason ⁶¹; and finally, Pachymeres reports charges of treason brought against the Bishop of Panion, who was similarly subject to the synod's judgment ⁶².

During Athanasios' patriarchates the bishops habitually used the synod as an excuse for their presence in the capital and as members of the synod, even tried to paralyze many of his social and ecclesiastical reforms, especially those which would have limited their honors and privileges. Athanasios, who had little use for these synodal gatherings because of the attendant corruption, tended to ignore the bishops in his administration of the Church and even held meetings without them ⁶³. Instead, he held meetings with a coterie of abbots. Pachymeres reports, for instance, that the patriarch read a letter concerning clerical officials «within a synod of abbots» (τῆς συνόδου τῶν ἡγουμένων) ⁶⁴. Although some authors take this to mean that Athanasios actually dissolved the *Synodos Endemousa* in order to get rid of the bishops and replaced it with a

59. V = 11V (TALBOT, 21; *Regestes*, 1682); LEMERLE, «Le tribunal», 325, comments that the tribunal heard only exceptional cases involving marriages; such does not seem to have been the case.

60. V = 13r (TALBOT, 26; *Regestes*, 1685); according to Pseudo - Kodinos, the Diocete was a minor court official performing no real function; see PSEUDO-KODINOS, *op. cit.*, 185.

61. DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 2260, 2262; PACHYMERES, II, 408.

62. PACHYMERES, II, 623.

63. V = 33r (TALBOT, 48; *Regestes*, 1694).

64. PACHYMERES, II, 643. 518.

synod of abbots⁶⁵, Pachymeres is unclear on this point and the patriarch's holding so-called synods with abbots in no way means that he abolished the permanent synod. More likely, he was simply by-passing episcopal assistance, a practice about which the bishops had actually complained. The synod did meet formally with the patriarch at least as late as 1304 when the *Neara* was issued and signed by twenty-one bishops, two of whom were bishops-elect (οἱ ὑποψήφιοι)⁶⁶. In a letter attacking the conspiracy of John Drimys, Athanasios referred to a synodal condemnation of the traitor. The letter, which because of its content must have been written during the winter of 1305/1306, specifically mentions the presence of the metropolitans of Sardis, Chalcedon, Pergamon, and the archbishops of Christianopolis and Derkos, and the bishops of Rhaidestos and Chariopolis⁶⁷. Clearly, opinions to the contrary, some form of synod was meeting, and Athanasios had not succeeded in ridding the capital of a significant number of bishops.

In his letters, Athanasios spoke only of his annoyance with the abuse of the traditional synodal system, especially in the area of its judicial competence in secular affairs; nowhere did he imply that he abolished it or desired to do so. At any rate, the question is irrelevant since the *Synodos Endemousa* was a traditional and not a constitutional element of the Constantinopolitan Church; Athanasios did not have to abolish it formally by patriarchal decree. He simply chose not to seek its advice. As troublesome as it was, it was the vehicle by which he could legislate his reform measures and vent complaints against unjust officials and exploitation by the wealthy.

65. ALICE-MARY TALBOT, «The Patriarch Athanasios and the Church (1289 - 1293; 1303 - 1309)», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XXVII (1973), 24; Talbot notes that Athanasios dissolved the *Synodos Endemousa* and replaces it with an annual synod and a synod of abbots. That the *Synodos Endemousa* was dissolved formally is suggested in only a brief passage of PACHYMERES (II, 518). Talbot refers to V = 14r - 14v (TALBOT, 31; *Regestes*, 1599) for support for the revival of the annual synod by Athanasios. The text referred to, however, simply states that the bishop «should stay a short while at the great yearly synod alone»; all indications are that the annual had been a regular occurrence as required by canon law.

66. RHALLÉS and POTLES, V, 122; also see V = 52r (*Regestes*, 1607).

67. V = 61r (TALBOT, 81; a *Regestes*, 1636).

Episcopal Residence

Canonical legislation on episcopal residence established in broad outline that a bishop could not be absent either indefinitely or for any significant period of time from his diocese without the permission of his metropolitan or the patriarch. At one point Athanasios reminded Andronicos of the canonical prescription that no bishop be absent from his see for «more than six months»⁶⁸. Not only was he well aware that canonically, jurisdiction was a bishop's most important attribute but that the immediate need of the people was for bishops to lead them through a time of trial. In Athanasios' letters the role of the bishop in his diocese is at once administrative, sacramental, and pedagogical. In addition to these ecclesiastical functions, the bishops in the large urban centers were prominent in civil administration and social services, providing aid for orphans and the aged, education, hospitals, and homes for travellers⁶⁹. The wholesale desertion of the bishops after 1300 would have naturally caused a decline in these services, and, in the reform thinking of Athanasios, would have represented a great betrayal of episcopal responsibility which had both secular and ecclesiastical implications.

Even though Athanasios had recourse to the coercive power

68. V = 14v (TALBOT, 32; *Regestes*, 1600). For early legislation see Canon 14 of Apostolic Canons (RHALLÉS and POTLES, II, 18) and Canon 15 of I Nicea (RHALLÉS and POTLES, II, 145). In addition the following are significant canonical and civil legislation covering the issue: JUSTINIAN, Novel 86, 8, in *Corpus Iurus Civilis*, III, prescribed the loss of the sacerdoce as punishment for absence beyond the six months permitted. Athanasios refers to this in V = 128r - 129v (*Regestes*, 1744); a later Novel, 123, 9 (*Corpus Iurus Civilis*, III), called only for suspension of the offending bishops and extended the permitted period of absence to one year. Canon 16 of the Council in Trullo recalls episcopal discipline to the limit of a six month absence, (RHALLÉS and POTLES, II, 369 - 370); see Balsamon's commentary on this canon (MIGNE, P.G. 137, col. 1072). Athanasios seems to refer to this canon in V = 42v - 43r (TALBOT, 62; *Regestes*, 1705). For civil legislation of a later period, see *Basilics*, Book III, Title I, 15, in N.I. SCHELTEMA and N. VAN DER WAL, (eds.), *Basilicorum Libria LX*, Series A, I (Groningen, 1955), 88, which repeats the content of Novel 123 of Justinian. A prostagma of Manuel I Comnenos (September 21, 1173) catalogued this previous legislation in light of the then current prolonged episcopal residence in the capital due to invasions and foreign occupations of Byzantine territories; see DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 1333a.

69. BRÉHIER, *Les Institution*, 414.

of the emperor in his effort to enforce canonical residence, he was for most of his patriarchates largely unsuccessful in achieving his goal. Not shrinking from blaming Andronicos, Athanasios wrote rather impatiently around 1305 or earlier:

I have often made the petition which is both lawful and suitable at this time (καὶ ἔννομον καὶ ἀρμόδιο τῷ καιρῷ), namely that each of the bishops should return to the see assigned to him, and gather together his people, and advise them, and train them to do what is pleasing to God⁷⁰

He made no false or polite attempts at humility, which would have been out of place in enforcing what the Church required. He found the presence of the bishops around his diocese «neither fitting for their soul [*sic*], not for me, nor for the people, nor is it even in accordance with ecclesiastical law»⁷¹. He wrote rather definitively: «It is not possible for me to support any longer the sojourn of the bishops; it is an illegal thing which carries peace neither to your majesty nor the Church»⁷². The situation was so onerous that Athanasios threatened to use violence if necessary: «willingly or unwillingly, I will throw them out of the city and answer to Christ for this daring deed»⁷³. He urged Andronicos to take control of the situation and send them back to their proper dioceses «lest we resort to violence and they leave against their will». He immediately averred, however, that «I am not one to fight». (οὐδὲ γὰρ τῆς μάχης ἐγώ)⁷⁴.

In a letter which may very well date from the latter part of his second patriarchate when he was tiring of the struggle and failing in health, Athanasios assumed an ironical tone in offering an alternative to this canonical solution: if Andronicos did not force the metropolitans out of the city, then the patriarch would allow them to divide the city among themselves⁷⁵ and he himself would leave⁷⁶. In short, Athanasios refused to be responsible for the chaos

70. V= 13r (TALBOT, 28; *Regestes*, 1620).

71. V= 13r (TALBOT, 28; *Regestes*, 1620).

72. V= 12v (TALBOT, 24; *Regestes*, 1623).

73. V= 14r (TALBOT, 30; *Regestes*, 1598): ἢ ἐκόντας ἢ ἄκοντας ἐξελάσω τῆς πόλεως, καὶ λόγον ὑπέξω Χριστῷ τοῦ τοιοῦτου τολμήματος.

74. V= 12v (TALBOT, 24; *Regestes*, 1623).

75. V= 14v (TALBOT, 32; *Regestes*, 1600).

76. V= 14r (TALBOT, 30; *Regestes*, 1598).

that had characterized his second tenure and requested that, if no action was to be taken against the chaos, Andronicos «give me one [united] flock to go to»⁷⁷.

For Athanasios, episcopal residence was first of all a question of the freedom of the Church to be internally coherent, conforming to her own rules rather than to the fancy of some wilful bishops. «With respect to what laws and canons provide concerning the freedom and good government of the Church, first of all, everyone should be content when she enjoys good order and rests on her own rules»⁷⁸. Such could not be the case as long as the bishops persisted in operating as private agents. That they acted with the tacit approval of the emperor was, for the patriarch, no mean issue but was at the very heart of the Byzantine polity, the role of the emperor as defender of the faith and *epistemonarch*, and the constitution of the Church.

We have seen, then, that canonical legislation on episcopal residence led Athanasios to attack the episcopal «refugees» in Constantinople on three fronts: (1) they abandon the faithful of their dioceses to the allurements of hostile religions; (2) they come to the city and occupy themselves in the pursuit of wanton luxury and dishonest gain; and (3) they stir up numerous irregularities in the patriarchate so that the patriarch could not even function as a bishop in his own diocese.

Conversions

The problem of conversions was not an idle threat to the Orthodox faithful living under either Latin or Turkish domination. In both cases, the occupying power possessed a religious motivation substantial enough to provide strong impetus for the conversion of the indigenous population. Such was especially the case among the Osmanli, who represent the general pattern of Turkish occupation in Anatolia. One author has written that

we have to do with no impetuous invasion of an Asiatic race, sweeping before it and destroying an effete civilization. It

77. V= 14r (TALBOT, 30; *Regestes*, 1598): ἡ μίαν ἡμᾶς παραχωρήσατε ποίμνην

78. V= 42v - 43r (TALBOT, 62; *Regestes*, 1705): Οἶα τοῖς νόμοις καὶ τοῖς κανόσι δοκεῖ τοῦ ἐλευθεριάζειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ εὐτακτεῖν, πρῶτως αὐτὴν εὐτακτοῦσαν καὶ ὄροις ἰδίοις ἰστώσαν ἀρκεῖσθαι καὶ ἕκαστον. . . .

is the birth of a new race we are recording - a race formed by the fusion of elements already existing at the place of its birth ⁷⁹

The weakening of the unity of the Orthodox population in Anatolia partly explains the Osmanli's rapid advance and certainly motivated Athanasios to affirm the canonical imperative of episcopal residence. Being Muslims, the Osmanli possessed a religious as well as a political impulse for attacks on the Byzantines ⁸⁰. The religious drive is called the «ghazi spirit» ⁸¹; and Osman their leader, described as a religious fanatic who, though religiously tolerant, had clear religious purposes among his objectives.

Direct and violent persecution was not Osman's pattern, though such would have been easier for Athanasios to handle. «Had he started to persecute Christians, the Greek Church would have taken a new lease on life, and Osman could not have gained the converts who made possible the Ottoman race» ⁸². After their initial conquests, the Osmanlis did not go about slaughtering the Christian population, but in most cases merely encouraged the people of Bithynia to join Islam; those that refused suffered disabilities, among them the obligation to pay the *haradj* or capitation tax for the privilege of being tolerated. If we reason that this tax was no worse than the Byzantine taxation, which bought the people only insecurity, then the conversion of large numbers of Orthodox for other than purely religious motives provides the basis for a new nation with a conquering sense of destiny. The new Turkish invaders

79. GIBBONS, *op. cit.*, 49; also V. LAURENT, «L'idée de guerre sainte et la tradition byzantine», *Revue Historique du sud-est européen*, XXIII (1946), 76.

80. LANGER and BLAKE, *op. cit.*, 497. Although some historians of the Osmanli reject this religious factor as the *primary* element in their expansion, they do admit that it played a role whose significance was all the more amplified by the social and political alienation of the Byzantine population of Anatolia.

81. WITTEK, «Deux chapitres de l'histoire des turks de Roum», *Byzantion*, II (1936), 301. On the beginnings of the Osmanli occupation, GEORGE G. ARNAKIS, Οἱ πρῶτοι Ὀθωμανοί. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς πτώσεως τοῦ ἑλληνισμοῦ τῆς μικρᾶς Ἀσίας (1282 - 1337), in *Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch - neugriechischen Philologie*, XLI (1947), 71 - 130.

82. GIBBONS, *op. cit.*, 53; Gibbons quotes a letter from the patriarch in 1385 to Pope Urban V to the effect that Murad left the Church liberty of action. VRYONIS, *op. cit.*, 299 - 300. Although Athanasios frequently referred to Christian suffering at the hands of the Islamic Turks and the weakening of

fought with a zeal characterized by an imperialistic sense of mission among the Christians of the newly conquered territories. Indeed, Pachymeres, in writing that Andronicos helplessly received news of the extermination of the Orthodox faith and institutions in Anatolia⁸³, is referring not only to the significant population shift, but also to the death and conversion of large numbers of Orthodox in former Byzantine territory.

No doubt, the people of Asia Minor felt deserted by their Orthodox co-religionists. The conversion to Islam by large numbers of Christians was less a result of the superiority of Islam and the weakness of Christian spirituality, than it was one of political alienation which carried with it an inevitable religious corollary. Especially for the upper classes, it was more convenient to go along with the conquering forces than take up the life either of a refugee or an alien within an Islamic society. Thus Athanasios saw a twofold problem produced by the Turkish expansion - conversions and refugees, both of which occupied his attention. The faithful in Asia Minor were justifiably suspicious of both the will and the ability of the central government to give them the protection required by the situation. The return of the bishops to their sees, at least where physically possible, would have been an affirmation, like Andronicos' *Notitia Episcopatum*, of the intention to hold on to the area in spite of military losses. No such resolution, however, was apparent on the part of the emperor. The problem, as Athanasios assured Andronicos, was more complicated than the mere military superiority of the Turks. It is clear that one way Andronicos might have defended the Orthodox faith, as well as assured a definitive solution to the loss of Orthodox in Anatolia to Turkish culture and Islam, was to have sent the bishops back to their dioceses as Athanasios demanded.

Conversions to the faith of the Turkish conquerors was not an imagined danger, especially in light of the disabilities to be avoided by such a move. Guillaume Adam described vividly the suffer-

the Christian faith, he nowhere referred to coerced conversions. He placed the blame for the losses to the faith on unfaithful bishops. On socially and religiously motivated conversions, see *ibid*, 417.

83. PACHYMERES, II, 338. In 1339 and 1340 the patriarch sent pleas to the Niceans to hold on to their Orthodox faith among the Muslims; see F. MIKLOSICH J. MÜLLER, *op. cit.*, Acta 82, 1339, and Acta 92, 1340.

ings of the Orthodox population under the Turks and the large scale commerce in Christian slaves⁸⁴. He also related that Christian religious practice was hindered and that in one case the Khan of the Tartars of Khasarie forced the Muslim leaders to forbid Christians from raising towers on their churches⁸⁵. In addition, Athanasios reported that the Turks did not permit Christians to strike the *symandron* to announce services⁸⁶.

One author has argued the process of Islamization was actually accelerated by the upper classes' ready acceptance of the Muslim religion and Turkish domination in exchange for economic security. On the other hand, the same author records that the masses resisted assimilation for centuries⁸⁷. In spite of this conclusion, it is clear that many of the lower classes were equally willing to change masters if the opportunity presented itself; in the process of such a change they had nothing material to lose.

According to a text of 1317, a large number of Christians who had remained in Amaseia were converted to Islam. The text emphasized the role which the presence of the metropolitan could have played in holding the flock together and in restoring it to a healthy condition⁸⁸. For one author, the number of conversions was so great that it actually demonstrated the oriental substratum which, with the arrival of Muslim Turks, took naturally to an oriental religion⁸⁹. Whatever the reasons, however, voluntary conversions were not uncommon in the face of a relatively tolerant, but religiously motivated conqueror.

In one letter to Andronicos, Athanasios asked the emperor why, since he was well aware of the destruction taking place in the east, he gave permission only to the bishops to leave? Should not all of the people have been invited to avoid this horror and suffering⁹⁰? Continuing, he noted that, since this was not the case and

84. GUILLAUME ADAM, «De modo Sarracenos extirpandi», in *Recueil des historiens des croisades, Documents arménien II* (Paris: Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, 1906), cxcii, 543 - 544.

85. *Ibid.*, cxc, 530 - 531.

86. V= 18v (TALBOT, 41; *Regestes*, 1622).

87. E. FRANCÈS, «La feodalité byzantine et la conquête turque», *Studia et Acta Orientalia*, IV (1962), 90.

88. MIKLOSICH and MÜLLER, *op. cit.*, I, 69 - 71.

89. LANGER and BLAKE, *op. cit.*, 481, n. 118.

90. V= 14r (TALBOT, 30; *Regestes*, 1598).

since Andronicos should have known «through the grace of the great God» that this had come about for chastisement, then the bishops should be sent back to be with their flocks; instead of allowing the shepherds to flee and to «feed» themselves, they must be forced to feed their sheep ⁹¹ Again, identifying Byzantium with Israel, he lamented to the bishops and the clergy that the «sons of Ishmael» rage with their impious errors among the Byzantines, and the ones «who possess the light and the truth», that is, the bishops, refuse to make the least effort to save the flock from ruin ⁹².

Athanasios alluded again to the danger of a flock without a shepherd when he wrote to the emperor:

Send the bishops with honor back to the sees assigned to them, lest their sheep be devoured by wolves (λυκόβρωτα) for lack of a shepherd, and lest they [the bishops] be ashamed when the Chief Shepherd (ἀρχιποίμενος) reveals Himself ⁹³.

In a letter congratulating Nicephoros Moschopoulos of Crete for his decision to take up a post as *proedros* of Lacedaimonia in the Peloponnesos, he declared that such a choice was especially pressing on every shepherd today since «there are not only wolves from among both the atheists (ἔξ ἄθέων = Turks) and the heretics who have fallen on the flock, but also from among us . . . both men and women break away» ⁹⁴. It is not clear who the «wolves» are; they may refer to either the Turks, the Arsenites, or the Latins but most likely to the Turks. In another place he warned a bishop that the good shepherd must do his duty, that is to leave Constantinople where he was behaving in a disorderly and an illegal manner, because of which «your flock has been scattered» ⁹⁵. He urged the unnamed bishop to return to his people so that they might hear the voice of their lawful shepherd, instead of hearing and following the voices of strange men ⁹⁶. If the patriarch was referring to Anatolia, which is the most likely option, he recognized that the faith

91. V= 14r (TALBOT, 30; *Regestes*, 1598).

92. V= 186v (*Regestes*, 1758).

93. V= 3v (TALBOT, 3; *Regestes*, 1673).

94. V= 131r (*Regestes*, 1627).

95. V= 130r (*Regestes*, 1746). The unnamed bishop is the Metropolitan of Apameia.

96. V= 130r (*Regestes*, 1746): ἀλλ' οἱμοι καὶ ἀλλοτρίαις φωναῖς ἐπισφαλῶς ἐπακολουθήσουσι.

of many of the people was being threatened by the invaders' Muslim religion or undermined by the preaching of the anti-government and anti-Church Arsenites, whose numbers were particularly strong in the area.

In spite of Athanasios' attention to the defense of the faithful in Anatolia, he was equally concerned with threats to the faith by other foreign elements within the empire. Not only were the people abandoned without any instruction, the patriarch complained, but they were «defiled as they ought not to be by the Jews and Armenians»⁹⁷. Athanasios was hostile to all non-Orthodox religions as dangerous to the faith of the people and a source of irritation to God. It followed from his understanding of the essential unity of the Orthodox commonwealth that there was no place for non-Orthodox within the empire, and more particularly the capital, and that the presence of such persons actually violated the purity and solidarity of the people and the Orthodox faith. In one letter on the subject, the patriarch called for the expulsion of all Jews, Armenians, Muslims, and Latin Christians from Constantinople⁹⁸. He succeeded, however, in securing only the expulsion of the Latin friars in 1305⁹⁹. By such efforts his name became anathema to the Latins, many of whom were still longing for the restoration of the Latin empire at Constantinople.

An implacable opponent of the presence of the Catalan Company in the empire, Athanasios wrote several letters to Andronicos in which he accused Roger de Flor of brutalizing the Byzantine people, threatening their Orthodox faith, and giving them the false illusion of a military solution to their predicament. In one place he actually chastized the emperor for not possessing more accurate information on the activity of Roger in Anatolia¹⁰⁰. After enumerating the crimes they had committed in Anatolia and Macedonia,

97. V= 16v (TALBOT, 36; *Regestes*, 1639). Michael VIII had attempted to repopulate the city by the introduction of Jews and Armenians after 1261; D. JACOBY, «Les quartiers juifs à Constantinople à l'époque byzantine», *Byzantion*, XXVII (1967), 189 - 205; and JOSHUA STARR, *Romania. The Jewries of the Levant after the Fourth Crusade* (Paris: Éditions du Centre, 1949), 25 - 35.

98. V= 18r - 15r (TALBOT, 41; *Regestes*, 1622).

99. PACHYMERES, II, 537 - 538.

100. V= 16r (TALBOT, 35; *Regestes*, 1630): διὰ τὶ δὲ ταῦτα, μὴ οἶδεν ἡ βασιλεία σου εἰς ἀκρίβειαν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ταῦτα μὴνύοντας ἀπωθεῖται . . .

he commented that «the Mogavares [Catalans] must be considered the enemy»¹⁰¹. In a letter directed at Latins in general he specifically referred to the «blood-thirsty» Catalans¹⁰² and called on Andronicos to play the role of the holy Moses and deliver the people from the tyranny and terror of the Sicilian (τοῦ Σικελοῦ)¹⁰². Typical of the patriarch's concern for the faith and the threat of the influence of Latin Catholics among his people was his call for Andronicos to send representatives of the Church to the islands which had fallen under Roger's domination:

I pray you to send to him, as many as you are able, members of the Church of Christ, for without them, they will cause you much evil and they will force the people of the Church, who are found in these regions [the islands], to convert to their belief against their will¹⁰⁴.

In addition to the problem of conversion, the absence of the bishops from their diocese created problems in civil affairs since they were immediately responsible for the functioning of numerous houses of charity, hospitals, and orphanages. These functions had devolved upon them from the time of Justinian and had characterized the office of the *defensores civitatis* or general administrative overseer of the urban bureaucracy¹⁰⁵. Athanasios not only urged Andronicos to force the bishops to return to their sees, still in Byzantine possession, but to give them the duty (actually not a new one) of reporting to the emperor about public officials who may have been abusing the people - an injustice which in the patriarch's thinking might well provoke the anger of God as well as increase the alienation of the people from the imperial government. In addition, the bishops could perhaps inspire the people and lend moral support in those cities threatened by the Turks.

Athanasios particularly deplored the sufferings of the Christians of Pisidia and Ancyra. Because the bishop was not with them to either correct or report the abuses, these people, he complained

101. V = 16r (TALBOT, 35; *Regestes*, 1630).

102. V = 47r (TALBOT, 68; *Regestes*, 1624).

103. V = 75v (TALBOT, 94; *Regestes*, 1608); GUILLAND, «Athanasios», 45 - 46; Guiland assumes that the term Σικελός refers to an official named Sikelos, (38, note 1); it refers rather to the Catalans; for this use of the term Σικελός, see V = 46v (TALBOT, 68; *Regestes*, 1624).

104. V = 6r (TALBOT, 9; *Regestes*, 1594).

105. Cf. Novel 86 of Justinian in *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 90.

become «food for wild beasts»¹⁰⁶. The nature of their misfortune is unclear though it does not seem to be a persecution by the Turks. In several instances Athanasios referred to government officials and commercial agents as «devouring the people», and a similar case is no doubt here implied.

It was precisely this moral and spiritual suffering of the people which forced Athanasios to his rigorist position with regard to refugee-bishops. Their wantonness, we shall see, made them all the more suspect to the ascetic reformer.

Moral Life

Athanasios' second major criticism of the bishops aimed at the moral quality of their lifestyle; he charged that they came to the city for the purpose of base gain:

Who has not understood that it is for the sake of base gain and bribes or comfort and wanton luxury that these men stay in the capital, as they trample upon the divine commandments through a multitude of illegal exactions¹⁰⁷?

With his monastic predilection as well as his reforming maximalism, Athanasios would have found such a pattern of life thoroughly reproachable in a layman; in a bishop, however, it must have represented an absolute betrayal of the pastoral function and monastic vocation. In a manner completely contrary to monastic practice and principle, he complained, the bishops prepare themselves only for banquets, theatres, and trouble-making. Instead of giving of themselves, as true shepherds must, they seek only gain. All good, he moaned, has left the Roman people and was buried, and the hierarchs, priests, and abbots were known only through «the filling of their hands»¹⁰⁸.

In a highly mutualistic fashion Athanasios attacked these itinerant bishops for robbing the poor; although this may refer to the possibility that the poor contributed to the Church and so the bishops were living off their donations, it most likely refers to the belief that ecclesiastical income was supposed to have been used to meet the needs of the people. He wrote:

106. V= 42v (TALBOT, 61; *Regestes*, 1704): The areas of Ancyra and Pisidia had been lost to Byzantine control since the Seljuk occupation of the mid-eleventh century; the bishops of these areas must have passed a great deal of time in Constantinople.

107. V= 58r (TALBOT, 79; *Regestes*, 1634).

108. V= 63r (*Regestes*, 1716): τῶν δὲ πληροῦντων τὴν χεῖρα γωορίζεσθαι.

If each of the bishops was rightly compelled to remain in the see assigned to him and if all of them (were compelled to) «pasture their sheep, and not themselves», rather than dining luxuriantly [sic] of what rightly belongs to the poor (ἐκ τῶν πτωχικῶν ἔγειν) . . . then God would remove all cowardice from us, and would show us His great works in us in right counsel ¹⁰⁹.

In addition to this money-grubbing, their misbehavior took the form of general disturbances, outrageous participation in drinking bouts, dissensions, and fights ¹¹⁰.

The bishops residing in the city had access to such institutional funds as the income from the monasteries which were granted for their residence and support. Athanasios specifically attacked the Metropolitan of Chalcedon, who had exhausted the resources of the Kosmidion Monastery which had been entrusted to his management ¹¹¹, and implied a similar misappropriation of ecclesiastical funds by the Chartophylax of Thessalonica and the Abbot of the Monastery of Akapniou¹¹². Instead of caring for souls and shepherding their flocks, «they themselves are being shepherded by the flock, receiving sustenance from the flock». He applied to these men the reproving words Ezekiel (34: 2,8) directed at the priesthood: «They feed themselves and not the sheep» ¹¹³ and distribute the goods of the Church, which by implication belong to the people, to their relatives and favorites.

The influx of refugees, fleeing either from the Turks of Anatolia or the rampaging Catalans in Thrace, placed a tremendous strain on available resources. In addition to the refugees, prisoners were brought into the city for ransom. Since selling ecclesiastical goods and even liturgical items to ransom prisoners and assist captives had a long and well-established history in eastern canon law, Athanasios considered this a good means not only to fulfill his duty to those in need but also to provide an ecclesiastical model for the wealthy to follow. The bishops, rather than supporting

109. V = 6v (TALBOT 14; *Regestes*, 1677).

110. V = 9r (TALBOT, 16; *Regestes*, 1678): εἰ μὴ εἰς συμπόσια καὶ εἰς σχίσματα καὶ εἰς παραχὰς.

111. V = 49r - 49v (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614).

112. V = 9v (TALBOT, 16; *Regestes*, 1678); it is not known for certain who this chartophylax was; see LAURENT, *Regestes*, 469, for possibilities.

113. V = 32v (TALBOT, 48; *Regestes*, 1694): ἔσω-τοὺς οὐ τὰ πρόβατα βόσκειν.

such an effort, bitterly fought the patriarch's use of ecclesiastical funds to that end. He lamented that when he wanted to sell Church property (τὰ ἱερὰ βουλόμεθα ἐξωνήσασθαι) to ransom captives who were being brought into the city and sold, the bishops wanted to use this money for their own purposes¹¹⁴ and tried to claim that the property did not belong to him. They were partially correct, but he was the bishop of the city and in principle responsible for the disposition of the affairs of the Church there. Athanasios made it clear that in his mind he is ultimately responsible for all ecclesiastical property¹¹⁵.

In addition to these abuses Athanasios attacked certain bishops for their speculations and investments. The Bishop of Vicina, for instance, lent out Church funds and received an income of 800 nomismata per year; the Metropolitan of Sardis owned a vineyard, a yoke of oxen, a garden, a workshop, and in addition to all these things held certain benefices (ἀδελφᾶτα). Athanasios scorned such possessiveness, especially when it occurred among bishops, who by custom were selected from the monastic circle, where private ownership was condemned in the slightest degree. For this sort of mundane activity, he bitterly commented, they have left their sees¹¹⁶.

Because of this misbehavior and fearful that other bishops would be tempted to seek the same benefits in Constantinople (as the Metropolitans of Philadelphia and Nymphaeum had recently done), Athanasios urged Andronicos to send these men back to their dioceses. Charging that such men were actually being paid to remain in the city and disturb the peace of the Church, Athanasios

114. V = 12v (TALBOT, 25; *Regestes*, 1613); by law the sale of sacred vessels and certain Church property was permitted for the ransom of captives only; see *Nomocanon* II, 2 (RHALLÉS and POTLES, I, 108 - 109) and Novel 65 of Justinian. LAURENT, *Regestes*, 402, writes that Athanasios uses the wrong term, ἀρχιμάλωτοι, for the refugees; he was not referring to the refugees. The ἀρχιμάλωτοι is a reference to prisoners.

115. V = 68r (TALBOT, 83; *Regestes*, 1718).

116. V = 12v (TALBOT, 25; *Regestes*, 1613): τί δὲ ἡ ἐνέργεια τούτων ἐνταῦθα, ὅτι κατέλιπον τὰς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν. The metropolitan Luke of Vicina was one of the supporters of John XII Cosmas and his diocese presumably had a substantial income from commercial properties; see PACHYMERES, II, 377. The term ἀδελφᾶτα, usually referring to income established by benefactors for the support of monks and monasteries, is used here to refer to compensation for the loss of a see.

informed Andronicos that he would no longer support any of these bishops from ecclesiastical revenues, but that the emperor might do so from his own funds if he so wished ¹¹⁷.

The bishops as occasional civil agents were accustomed to performing civil functions, and those in Constantinople were often called to the meetings of the *Synodos Endemousa* to judge civil as well as ecclesiastical suits. Men in such a position of power were predisposed, regardless of their ecclesiastical position, to dishonesty, and Athanasios specifically accused them of taking bribes and rendering favorable decisions to those offering the largest sum of money. Their decisions, he claimed, were not reached on the basis of the truth, but on the basis of money, and the deliberations were correspondingly a farce ¹¹⁸; they were in fact enriching themselves at the expense of the people who had recourse to the synod for redress of offenses suffered at the hands of the wealthy nobles and powerful public officials. Athanasios complained that it was virtually impossible to get an equitable decision out of the bishops, who had been bought by one of the parties before the actual hearing:

I have often mentioned to your divine majesty that if every bishop does not return to his assigned see, the Church will not cease to be troubled by confusion and rebellion, for I want them to have some concern for legal proceeding; for none of the nobles comes to trial without first negotiating with these (bishops) ¹¹⁹.

117. V= 12v (TALBOT, 25; *Regestes*, 1613); Athanasios is obviously referring to Theoleptos of Philadelphia who was present in the capital in 1303 (PACHYMERES, II, 358), but returned to his see in 1304 to defend it against the Turks. It is difficult to understand why the patriarch attacked Theoleptos who, like Athanasios, was a man of action, a defender of the poor, a violent anti-Arsenite, and largely stayed in his see; V. LAURENT, «Les crises religieuses à Byzance: le schisme anti-arsénite du metropolite de Philadelphie Théoleptus (+ c. 1324)», *Revue des Études byzantine*, XVIII (1960), 45 - 54. It is difficult to identify the Metropolitan of Nymphaeum here mentioned.

118. V= 13v (TALBOT, 28; *Regestes*, 1620); see also for text (from Paris Suppl. Gr. 516) and discussion, GENNADIOS, *Historia*, 310.

119. V= 12v (TALBOT, 25; *Regestes*, 1613): οὐδεὶς γὰρ τῶν δυναστῶν μὴ πρότερον μεταχειρισάμενος τούτους εἰς κρίσιν ἔρχεται. GENNADIOS, *Historia*, 379, takes this passage to refer to the fact that civil courts had to wait on ecclesiastical decisions before they could take action. No such duality is evident in the letter.

In another letter he mentioned that the bishops even came to blows over decisions, but not for the love of justice or truth (ὄχι ἕνα τὸ δίκαιον) ¹²⁰.

Athanasios offered a similar picture of corruption in ecclesiastical elections, which can only be categorized as simoniacal. When it came to the election of a bishop, the patriarch informed Andronicos, the various candidates «bribe them [the electors] with wine and melons». When, for example, Athanasios convoked a synod meeting to fill a vacant see, the bishops proposed only unqualified candidates. He urged them to be vigilant in electing pastors and reminded them not to allow considerations of friendship, fears, gifts, or flattery to determine their choices ¹²¹. Having already accused many of the bishops, he condemned the emperor, implying that he was not active in insuring the purity of the priesthood:

the Church has been profaned and attacked, so that not only through ignorance are unworthy men brought into the clergy, but also men who are known to be unworthy ¹²².

The very constitution of the Church was at stake precisely at a time when the most dedicated leaders were needed. Athanasios' solution was simple enough; he carried on the work of the patriarchate, including presumably the selection of bishops for vacant sees, without the assistance of his synod. When he did this, the bishops charged him with «disregard of the canons» ¹²³ and they were probably correct.

Ecclesiastical Interference in Constantinople

Writing to Andronicos, Athanasios stated another of his basic objections to the bishops living in Constantinople; they not only pursued a decadent life, but they also attempted to undermine Athanasios' authority by ignoring liturgical services and prac-

120. V = 32v (TALBOT, 48; *Regestes*, 1694); see also V = 9r - 9v (TALBOT, 16; *Regestes*, 1678); V = 12v (TALBOT, 25; *Regestes*, 1613).

121. V = 124v - 125r (*Regestes*, 1740); Athanasios quotes Hebrews 4:12, calling the clergy to account for the quality of their leadership.

122. V = 16v (TALBOT 36; *Regestes*, 1639). On imperial responsibility for the holiness of the priesthood, see Dvornik's discussion of Justinian's Sixth Novel, DVORNIK, *op. cit.*, 816 - 817.

123. V = 33r (TALBOT, 48; *Regestes*, 1694). See Canon 4 of I Nicaea (RHALLÉS and POTLES, II, 243) and Canon 6 of Sardica (RHALLÉS and POTLES, III, 243).

tice ¹²⁴. He accused them of disrespect in not bothering even to put on vestments and of lack of concern in failing to attend liturgical services and even to pray. Making frequent use of images of the warrior, Athanasios charged that the bishops who rejected his invitations to participate in expiatory processions were like generals who refused to fight. In response to their claim that they were too weak in body, he assumed a sarcastic tone and wondered how then they could be so busy making a living in the capital ¹²⁵. He specifically attacked the Bishop of Trianopolis in Thrace, who not only failed to pray or keep vigils, but mocked «me when I devote myself to such practices» ¹²⁶. The bishop of Trianopolis seemed typical of many bishops residing in the city not only in his hostility toward Athanasios but also in his scorn for him personally. Indeed, Athanasios must have appeared as a comic figure to ecclesiastics who, used to luxury, wealth, and soft living, were the objects of his disdain.

As during Athanasios' first patriarchate, many of the bishops were eager to rid themselves of this rigorist conscience. Gregoras confirmed Athanasios' report that they passed a good deal of time in secret meetings and uncanonical assemblies (αἱ πρᾶσυναγωγαί) ¹²⁷, saying that in addition to coming to the city for safety, they meddled intimately in the affairs of the patriarchate «in order to conspire here against each other and against [Athanasios]» ¹²⁸. Why else, Athanasios asked, do these men come unlawfully to the city under all sorts of pretexts except «that they take pleasure in naming and deposing patriarchs?» ¹²⁹ Such was indeed the case. They were the prime movers, for instance, in both of Athanasios' resignations. Even though at the end of each of his patriarchates he could count virtually no supporters among the hierarchy, Athanasios approached this hostility rather philosophically, noting that such oppo-

124. V = 8v - 9r (TALBOT 15; *Regestes*, 1611)

125. V = 43r (TALBOT, 62; *Regestes*, 1705). On the prohibition of commercial activity by bishops, see Canon 10 of II Nicea (RHALLS and POTLES, II, 587 - 588).

126. V = 13v - 14r (TALBOT, 30; *Regestes*, 1598); this probably refers to his enemy Niphon of Cyzicus who succeeded him on the ecumenical throne.

127. V = 33r (TALBOT, 48; *Regestes*, 1694).

128. GREGORAS I, 181 - 182.

129. V = 158v - 159r (*Regestes*, 1750).

sition to established ecclesiastical authority had become established custom since 1261.

The bishops not only opposed him personally but actually attempted to perform functions properly performed only by Athanasios as the bishop of the city. Referring to this interference in the internal affairs of the Church of Constantinople, Athanasios wrote:

In no other city is it possible for the bishop of another city to perform any function whatsoever contrary to the wishes of its bishop, but here everyone does whatever he wants ¹³⁰.

Although it was against the law for a bishop «even to teach in any diocese except his own» ¹³¹, these bishops attempted to function as if they had carried their diocese with them; they performed ordinations, exercised authority over the people of Constantinople, and even refused to commemorate Athanasios' name during liturgical services ¹³². The latter is not surprising in light of the virtual schism between him and a substantial number of the bishops after he retook the ecumenical throne. Many simply did not accept him as patriarch and so, against ecclesiastical law, refused to have his name mentioned in the services. In one letter he complained against the Metropolitan of Sardis who actually stopped the celebrant of the liturgy from commemorating the patriarch. Pachymeres recorded that eventually Athanasios had it firmly established that only his name might be commemorated in Constantinople ¹³³. This was no doubt accomplished after the end of the schism on Palm Sunday, 1304.

In one of his letters, perhaps one of the more significant in the collection, he attacked both Athanasios of Alexandria and Cyril, Bishop of Tyre, whose transfer to the Patriarchate of Antioch Athanasios refused to recognize and charged them with being the source of two of the five great schisms which had afflicted the Church recently ¹³⁴. Athanasios complained that Athanasios of Alexandria

130. V = 13v (TALBOT, 28; *Regestes*, 1620): ἐνταῦθα δὲ εἶ τι καὶ βούλεται ἕκαστος.

131. V = 43r (TALBOT, 62; *Regestes*, 1705); see Canon 20 of the Council in Trullo (RHALLS and POTLES, II, 349).

132. V = 49v (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614); see Canon 35 of the Canons of the Apostles (RHALLS and POTLES, II, 47) and Canons 13 and 22 of Antioch (RHALLS and POTLES, III, 150 - 151, 164 - 165).

133. PACHYMERES II, 616.

134. V = 47v - 48r (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614).

«weighs my actions in authority»¹³⁵ and compared him to the famous antagonist of St. John Chrysostom, Theophilus of Alexandria. The comparison is significant because Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria (385 - 412), effectively disturbed the life of the Church of Constantinople and finally arranged for the deposition of its patriarch, John, at the Synod of the Oak in 403. Listing several ecclesiastics, the patriarch complained that «people who are supposedly on our side or educated go over to this man [Athanasios of Alexandria]»¹³⁶ and specifically charged the Alexandrian with performing irregular ordinations¹³⁷. Reacting to the charge, the Alexandrian added to his numerous acts of opposition and even composed a satire on the patriarch which he circulated throughout the city¹³⁸.

During his first patriarchate, Athanasios had managed to rid the city of the Patriarch of Alexandria¹³⁹; the monasteries granted him by Michael VIII were confiscated and the name of Athanasios of Constantinople inserted into their services¹⁴⁰. Athanasios of Alexandria remained exiled on Rhodes until the patriarch was deposed in 1293; he then returned, received the Monastery of Christ Evergetes, and became influential in domestic and foreign affairs¹⁴¹. From this position of influence he quite naturally, though unsuccessfully, opposed Athanasios' return to the Patriarchate in 1303¹⁴². After March, 1304, when the schism seems to have been healed, the Alexandrian still opposed the patriarch. Categorizing the Alexandrian patriarch as a law breaker, Athanasios bemoaned the fact

135. V = 48v (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614); Theophilus of Alexandria was patriarch from 385 - 412.

136. V = 49r - 49v (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614).

137. V = 48v (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614); he charges that these ordinations occurred in the house of a certain Paul Choraules.

138. PACHYMERES, II, 120 - 121, 409, 579.

139. MURALT, *op. cit.*, 460; PACHYMERES II, 203.

140. PACHYMERES, II, 120 - 121. Since the patriarch's name was the same as Athanasios of Alexandria, he made the monks assure him that when they said «Athanasios» they intended to commemorate him.

141. See PACHYMERES, II, 203; DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 2275; a chrysobull dated before 1305 granted him the Monastery of Christ Evergetes in Constantinople; see RAYMOND JANIN, *La Géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantine*, I (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1953), 522 - 524. Also J. PARGOIRE, «Le couvent de l'Evergètès», *Échos d'Orient*, IX (1906), 231.

142. PACHYMERES, II, 409; GREGORAS, I, 216 - 217.

that instead of being punished he seemed to have been rewarded with the grant of another monastery after having lost the two granted by Michael VIII. Attacking the emperor as the man «entrusted by God with the sword for this very purpose»¹⁴³, he warned Andronicos of the prophetic testimonies concerning those who do not punish evildoers (III Kings 21: 35 - 36; Habbakuk 1: 4)¹⁴⁴; to avert God's righteous anger the emperor must expel the «so-called Patriarch of Alexandria» (τοῦ λεγομένου Ἀλεξανδρείας) who was actually bringing judgment on his own soul and his monastery. In a minor, albeit belated, victory, he finally succeeded in getting the Alexandrian to leave the city in 1305, and in the same year the monastery which Andronicos had turned over to his care was transferred by a chrysobull to Athanasios of Constantinople¹⁴⁵.

Cyril of Antioch, the patriarch's second leading opponent, represented just one of many patriarchs of Antioch who had found refuge in Constantinople when in 1263¹⁴⁶ conflicts between Franks, Greeks, and Arabs threw the Church of Antioch into confusion. Cyril tried to carry on the affairs of Antioch as if his entire diocese was in exile and set up alongside the canonical jurisdiction of Athanasios of Constantinople. Furthermore like the Alexandrian, Cyril was charged with acting against synodal and patriarchal decisions and with dismissing priests, who, of course, came to Athanasios for redress of their grievances¹⁴⁷. Athanasios refused to have his name inserted into the diptychs or to recognize him as Patriarch of Antioch¹⁴⁸ and always referred to Cyril as «the Bishop of Tyre»

143. V = 47r (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614): ὁ πρὸς αὐτὸ τοῦτο τῆν μάχαιραν χειρισθεὶς πρὸς Θεοῦ

144. V = 48r (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614).

145. Cf. DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 2288; JANIN, *Églises*, 523; PACHYMERES, II, 579.

146. J. NASRALLAH, «Chronologies des patriarches melkites d'Antioche de 1250 à 1500», *Proche-Orient Chrétien*, XVII (1967), 194.

147. V = 49r (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614); for discussion, see LAURENT, «Le patriarche», 315.

148. V. LAURENT, «Le patriarche d'Antioche Cyrille II (1287 - c. 1308)», *Analecta Bollandiana*, LXVIII (1950), 310 - 317; although Cyril was in Constantinople to have his election to the Antiochian throne confirmed since the reign of Gregory of Cyprus, he did not achieve his aim until John XII Cosmas became patriarch. See PACHYMERES II, 123, for the reasons for his rejection by Athanasios and V = 48v (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614).

(ὁ Τύρου) and his followers as «the Tyrians». Not until Cyril's death in 1307 was Athanasios rid of his presence; at that time he took possession of the Monastery of the Theotokos Hodegetria, which had been Cyril's residence ¹⁴⁹.

To these two enemies Athanasios added the bishops of Jerusalem, Sardis, Chalcedon, Pergamon, and others. In fact, what Athanasios described in his letters is not simply personality conflicts or even substantive disagreements, but rather the anomalous ecclesiastical situation in which churches having no geographical bounds were centered on individuals who held dubious and titular claims to dioceses far from Constantinople. The situation was a canonical nightmare which no ecclesiastical rigorist could have tolerated. The remedy was clear; all the bishops were to leave unless they had a valid function in the city and all benefices were to be confiscated and returned to the jurisdiction of the Church of Constantinople.

Athanasios' success can be discussed in relative terms only. He may have achieved his goals, but the process required almost all of his energies during his second patriarchate. Sometimes he felt deserted by Andronicos who, instead of attending to the canons and the needs of the people, plied the offending bishops with honors and favors (*ἀδείας βασιλικῆς*) ¹⁵⁰. Athanasios' approach to Andronicos implied that his inaction actually encouraged disreputable men to stay in the city and make merry on benefices granted by imperial favors, the final effect being to render his own oath of 1303 — to do all in his power in behalf of the good and freedom of the Church — ineffective.

149. PACHYMERES, II, 123; LAURENT, «Le patriarche», 311, 580.

150. V= 33r (TALBOT, 48; *Regestes*, 1694).

Chapter V

ATHANASIOS AND THE REFORM OF CLERICAL ABUSES

The Clergy of Saint Sophia

Athanasios was troubled by the conduct and behavior of the lower clergy of St. Sophia, who, like the bishops in the capital, suffered from lack of discipline and disliked Athanasios for his rigorous reforms and constant criticism. The conflict eventually reached such a point that the clergy of St. Sophia refused to perform their normal ecclesiastical functions and instituted what may be characterized as a «strike». This issue centered on their salary.

For the purposes of this investigation it is sufficient to point out that the number of the clergy of St. Sophia seems to have been considerable throughout Byzantine history. In fact, although it is difficult to uncover many details about the cathedral staff after the sixth century, their financial support seems on several occasions to have worried the emperor. Justinian, for instance, had ordered that their numbers be limited to five hundred and twenty-five, a number which could reasonably be supported by the Cathedral's income¹. Following Justinian, there were other efforts to reduce the number of clergy and keep it in line with income. Hence,

1. Justinian's Novel 3, 1 of 535 limited the number of clergy to five hundred and twenty-five. The figure was divided among priests, deacons, deaconesses, sub-deacons, readers, singers, and doorkeepers. In the seventh century the emperor Heraclios, due to financial pressures, again tried to reduce the number of clergy from 625 to the figure established by Justinian. The anti-Photian synod of 869 tried to limit the number of clergy in all of the churches in Constantinople; see BRÉHIER, *Les institutions*, 395. It can be assumed that essentially the same liturgical functions survived into the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and that there was something of a reduction in the number of clergy after the Latin occupation of Constantinople (1204 - 1261). Bréhier concludes for the period under study, on the basis of reports in the *Traité* of PSEUDO-KODINOS, that «par rapport au VIIe siècle, le nombre des fonctions est plus grand, mais le chiffre du personnel est très réduit . . . » See *ibid.*, 396.

Athanasios was not facing a new problem. The present strain on the resources of St. Sophia dated from 1204, when Latin occupiers confiscated most of the goods and property of the patriarchate and St. Sophia; continuous erosion of the empire steadily worsened the situation. By a series of chrysobulls between 1268 and 1271, Michael VIII had restored the domains of St. Sophia, but the revenues of the Church were not sufficient to support the clergy and the functionaries of the patriarchate²; early in the fourteenth century St. Sophia lost income-producing properties in Asia Minor.

Athanasios publically abused the clergy of St. Sophia, who in turn complained that he not only overwhelmed them with scorn but prevented them from obtaining any higher offices and a «reasonable» salary³. Throughout the affair Athanasios defended his actions, especially his withholding the income from the clergy. They were, according to the patriarch, deprived of their revenue due to bad times, limited resources, and their failure to perform their ecclesiastical functions worthily.

In contrast to Athanasios' account in his letters, Pachymeres describes a situation in which the withdrawal of their income in 1307 caused the clergy of St. Sophia to lose their desire to perform their functions and to behave as if communion with the patriarch and the Church had been broken (ὡς εἰπεῖν ἀπεσχίζοντο). The clergy appealed to Andronicos for satisfaction, and he in turn urged Athanasios to restore at least half of their former pay, six or eight nomismata per year, depending on their rank. It is clear, however, that Athanasios had neither the desire nor the resources to pay the clergy at the previous rate. To deal with the situation, he called the clergy to a meeting in the midst of a «synod of abbots»⁴ and attacked them generally, condemning their worldly style of life.

In the face of this attack, the leading clergy» (ἐκκλησίας πρωτεύοντες) wrote a letter, recorded by Pachymeres, which answered all the patriarch's points⁵ and asked that he have the courtesy to read their letter in the assembly of the abbots⁶, where he made his

2. DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 1956; the administration of the goods of St. Sophia were separate from the common goods of the Patriarchate.

3. PACHYMERES, II, 642; Pachymeres closes his history with an account of this affair and hence it dates from 1306 - 1307.

4. PACHYMERES, II, 643.

5. PACHYMERES, II, 642, 643 - 650.

6. PACHYMERES, II, 647.

attacks. They charged that Athanasios had created his own laws, which were not those of the Church. In addition, they argued that they had done their job, not out of base gain, but for the good of the entire Church; simply because some of them refuse to work for six nomismata a year did not make them guilty of vanity and avarice, «certainly not by the holy laws which our Fathers have left us»⁷. They demanded that Athanasios show them the canons which permitted them «to die of hunger» (ἀπὸ λιμοῦ ἀποθνήσκειν)⁸. They rejected the patriarch's claim that the Church was poverty stricken and that they were not paid because they did not attend all the services of the Church. Since many other officials of St. Sophia, such as the Oeconomos, the Sacristan, and the Chartophylax, were not obliged to attend, they claimed to be unjustly singled out for persecution⁹. If, in fact, they did neglect their clerical functions, they did so out of discouragement, since the patriarch deprived them of any possibility of advancement in rank!

The last complaint was not without justification since for more than a century after the abdication of Gregory of Cyprus, only two clerics of St. Sophia had become patriarch¹⁰ and on the occasion of similar complaints during his patriarchate, Patriarch John Cosmas admitted that the practice of selecting bishops from among only monastic candidates was «uncanonical»¹¹. But perhaps the clerics' point which most illuminates the monastic basis of Athanasios' reforms is their claim that he wanted them to live like monks, a demand which they said would require them to close the churches to the people and give up their family life. The monks, they argued, have no practical cares to keep them from their religious services¹². Whatever Athanasios' explicit demands, his program created the impression that he wanted the secular clergy to conform to monastic discipline. They asked, in closing their apologia, only

7. PACHYMERES, II, 644.

8. PACHYMERES, II, 647.

9. PACHYMERES, II, 644.

10. BREHIER, *Les institutions*, 387.

11. PACHYMERES, II, 186 - 187.

12. PACHYMERES, II, 648: εἰ κατὰ μοναχοὺς καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὡς ἐκεῖνοι ἐκκλησιαζόμεθα, ὥστε μὴ καλῶς ἐπιφώσκειν τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ ἀπολύειν, μηδὲ τινὰς τῶν ἕξω προσπαπτῶν.

that the patriarch give them a little rest and that he no longer torment them by his rigorous ordinances ¹³.

Athanasios complained against the clergy of St. Sophia in some twelve letters: they do not wear proper liturgical vestments for the services; they arrive at Church as if they were performing a favor rather than fulfilling an obligation ¹⁴; honors and ecclesiastical elevation come from virtue not necessity ¹⁵, and having behaved dishonorably during the «recent confusion» in the Church, they deserved to be ignored ¹⁶; some actually left their responsibilities for more profitable secular positions and honors, and some even rejected the bond of the priesthood which is indissoluble (δεσμιδὸς ἀδιάλυτος) ¹⁷. In one letter Athanasios called on the bishops to forbid all clergy from seeking civil authority (ἀρχαῖς κοσμικαῖς) and military functions (στρατεία) ¹⁸ and affirmed that the priesthood, having been immediately ordained by God, is greater than these two professions. He called on all clergy at St. Sophia to take an oath not to betray the «things of heaven» for base gain ¹⁹. Particularly horrified that men would seek personal gain at a time of such human misery and suffering, he prescribed excommunication for any priests «voluntarily» leaving their vocation ²⁰ and commented it would have been better had these men not been born. The central problem was, however, that of salary. Athanasios insisted in his letters that he had had to cut their income because they failed to provide services and that, when he saw them doing their duties (λειπούργημα), they receive their pay, following the ancient custom, part in September and part in March. The ones who

13. PACHYMERES, II, 646 - 647; Athanasios forbade the clergy to talk at services or to lean on walls.

14. V = 58r (TALBOT, 79; *Regestes*, 1643); also see V = 127v (*Regestes*, 1770).

15. V = 208r (*Regestes*, 1764); see V = 216r (*Regestes*, 1768).

16. V = 208v (*Regestes*, 1764); Athanasios charged that the clergy of St. Sophia had signed a document agreeing to the Union of Lyons.

17. V = 209v (*Regestes*, 1765).

18. V = 139r (*Regestes*, 1747). He referred to Canons 3 and 7 of Chalcedon, which anathematize any priest who engages in a military career or secular administration.

19. V = 211r - 211v (*Regestes*, 1761). The same condemnation appears in V = 209v - 210r (*Regestes*, 1765).

20. V = 139v (*Regestes*, 1747).

were lazy would receive nothing²¹. But even though the patriarch so committed himself, he had to turn to the emperor to supply the funds.

Ecclesiastical income had been so severely reduced, however, that Athanasios could promise dutiful clergy only a reduced salary, and urged the clergy to meditate on the universal destruction and shipwreck which had come upon the empire and moderate their salary demands²². Awareness of the true extent of the empire's ruin would inspire them, he was certain, to greater supplications for relief from God. After all, he reminded them, this was why they were granted exemptions (ἐξκουσσεια) from fiscal responsibilities²³. Indeed, they would continue to receive reduced salaries only if they perform their functions:

For the glory and supplication of God, the priests, the deacons, the singers and readers should be in their places piously doing whatever is fitting to each. Each day they should take care of the divine things, unless there happens to be a serious problem such as an illness; even then his absence must be made known to the one who is the leader of each order and a dispensation requested²⁴.

Towards the end of the conflict, his tone was more sympathetic:

And if [these duties are] done, it will be up to my saintly emperor to demonstrate towards you a great concern. I know that he has a great and incomparable care for the Church's honor and maintenance (ἐπιδοσιν[σις]). According to God's great wisdom, he will distribute the [pay] to the clergy²⁵.

In demonstrating a more sympathetic approach, Athanasios, in a letter to Andronicos, actually outlined the terrible sufferings of the clergy of St. Sophia, telling Andronicos that those who care for «holy things» have a right to «eat» in return; the clergy at St. Sophia are «crying poverty up and down»²⁶. He agreed with the

21. V = 215r (*Regestes*, 1767).

22. V = 215r (*Regestes*, 1767).

23. V = 206r (*Regestes*, 1763).

24. V = 215v (*Regestes*, 1768): ἱερεῦσι καὶ διακόνοις, εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ καὶ δυσώπησιν καὶ ψάλλταις καὶ ἀναγνώσταις προσεδρεία ἐν εὐλαβείᾳ καὶ ἀνελλιπέι. Οἷς καὶ προσῆκον ἐκάστου βαθμοῦ τοῖς θεοῖς διημερεύειν, εἰ μὴ που γε τίς συνεισπέσοι ἀνάγκη βαρεία. Ἡ νόσος ἀπείρξει· ποιοῦντα καὶ τότε τὴν ἀπουσίαν δῆλην· τοῦ εἰργομένου τῷ ἐκάστης πρωτεύοντες τάξεως· κάκειθεν συγγνώμην αἰτεῖν.

25. V = 221v (*Regestes*, 1772).

26. V = 220v (*Regestes*, 1772): ἄνω καὶ κάτω πένιαν ἀποκλαιόμενοι

complaints of the clerics, as outlined in Pachymeres, that their suffering caused them to murmur constantly and to become lazy and went on to explain that Andronicos could not permit this to continue and asked him to assure a just salary to all those who work in St. Sophia. He did not, however, soften his own stand; the salaries were reduced and could only be paid to those who performed their duties suitably.

Going a step further to accommodate the clergy, Athanasios offered them the opportunity to administer the distribution of their own salaries; if they so wished, they might select a pious and trustworthy man to manage the revenue of St. Sophia, thereby ensuring a fair distribution of income²⁷. This letter, more sympathetic and conciliatory, seems to have recognized their genuine financial needs, reminding them that hard times are no excuse for not doing a job²⁸. If they did not accept his proposal, then Athanasios would take the entire task into his own hands and, he had earlier indicated, deliver one-half of the traditional salary to any cleric doing his job properly and withhold the salary of the others²⁹. *Vaticanus Graecus* 2219 contains a letter in which the priest Theophylactos Libidikes, in keeping with the second alternative, promised to fulfill his priestly duties satisfactorily in return for half of his former salary³⁰. It seems evident from this letter that the clergy had opted for Athanasios' second proposal. It is likely, however, that their general discontent continued, along with that of the monks and the bishops, and would contribute to the patriarch's final resignation.

General Instructions to the Clergy

Athanasios' instructions to the bishops, clergy, and abbots are largely distributed throughout his letters, often without distinction as to which class he was addressing. Since they are fundamentally moral and religious, they should properly be considered separately under social and moral reforms; nonetheless, the content of several of the instructions indicates the definite moral and

27. V= 220r (*Regestes*, 1771).

28. V= 219v (*Regestes*, 1771).

29. V= 220r (*Regestes*, 1771).

30. V= 219r - 219v; see GENNADIOS, *Historia*, 392: γράμμα ὑποσχετικὸν τοῦ ἀρχοντος τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν . . .

social collapse within the empire. What other conclusion can be drawn from the numerous prohibitions against frequenting magicians, gypsies, and soothsayers, against wearing of magic amulets, against trafficking in «snakes», and against receiving medical attention from Jews or «other heretics» (ἡ ἄλλων αἰρετικῶν)³¹. All these proscriptions indicate social dislocation, decay, and alienation among a large portion of the Byzantine people.

Athanasios warned the bishops and metropolitans to exercise the greatest care in selecting and ordaining clergy; anyone to be brought into the Church must be investigated - «Let us search out his activities»³² — and should not even be presented for ordination without someone to vouch for his faith. He urged the bishops not to lay hands «too quickly on anyone»³³. Athanasios was particularly horrified at the possibility of simoniacal ordinations; ruin, he warned, will come from God upon anyone «who puts forward someone for money, or those who agree with the choosing of a clergyman [by a secular] ruler»³⁴.

In general, Athanasios' instructions to the bishops and clergy heavily emphasized not only moral purity and canonical regularity but, ritual purity. The holiness of the churches and the space around them, for example, must not be violated by such commercial enterprises as selling goods and hawking customers outside the church doors or within the church enclosures or grounds (ιερώων περιβόλων); anyone who enters into such practices must be excommunicated³⁵.

Even more indicative of a Judaizing sense of ritual purity and Old Testamental influence are Athanasios' prohibitions against eating meat from strangled animals, a rule which was first established for the Church at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15: 29). In several places he called on the bishop to excommunicate anyone who drinks the blood of any animal so killed³⁶.

31. V = 139v (*Regestes*, 1747).

32. V = 139r (*Regestes*, 1747).

33. V = 139r (*Regestes*, 1747).

34. V = 139r (*Regestes*, 1747: Τοὺς ἐπιχρήμασι τοῦ κανόνος προβαλλομένους τινα, ἢ δι' ἀρχοντικῆς ἐκλογῆς συνάμα τοῖς συναινοῦσι αὐτοῖς. The same judgment is made for tonsuring a monk or the designating of a spiritual father for money.

35. V = 139v (*Regestes*, 1747).

36. V = 143v (*Regestes*, 1747) and 158r - 158v (*Regestes*, 1749). See Canon 83 of the Apostolic Canons (RHALLER and POTLES, II, 107) and Canon 67 of

Athanasios' sense of ritual purity was especially rigorous in the case of priests themselves. Bishops must forbid entry to the sanctuary to any priest who is unchaste³⁷. Furthermore, if a priest's wife has had sexual intercourse with another man, either willingly or unwillingly, the priest might continue in his sacerdotal function only if he ceased to live with her³⁸. Only in this way could the purity of the priesthood and the integrity of marriage be protected. It also excluded from ordination men who had entered into acts of sexual perversion³⁹. Athanasios also condemned any priest who, on the death of his wife, sought to contract a second marriage, saying the priest must remain the image of wisdom and temperance and shun such «decadence»⁴⁰!

the Council in Trullo (RHALLS AND POTLES, II, 439), which prescribes the deposition of a cleric and excommunication of a layman for eating the flesh of a strangled animal or drinking the blood of an animal. A Judaizing tendency is evident in Byzantine ecclesiastical thought and practice from an early period; for instance, see Canon 66 of the Apostolic Canons (RHALLS AND POTLES, II, 60), which forbids fasting on the Sabbath (Saturday), and Canon 60 of the Council in Trullo (RHALLS AND POTLES, II, 425), which attacks Roman Christians for fasting on the Sabbath. Many of these same Old Testamental prohibitions constituted a large part of the anti-Latin polemic among Orthodox in the eleventh century. See GEORGE EVERY, *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451 - 1204* (London: SPCK, 1962), 185 - 191.

37. V = 146r - 146v (*Regestes*, 1748); see Canon 63 of Apostolic Canons (RHALLS AND POTLES, IV, 102).

38. V = 140r (*Regestes*, 1747). The only comparable canonical reference is Canon 8 of the Council of Neocaesarea (circa 315). This canon maintains that a priest must leave an adulterous wife if he wishes to continue in his ministry (RHALLS AND POTLES, III, 73). Athanasios' regulations for priests closely parallels the Old Testamental prescription outlined in detail in Leviticus 21, especially 21:7, 13 - 15. The case here described by Athanasios and the solution to the dilemma are more rigorous than the Judaic prescriptions, applying as they do to an admittedly innocent woman. Athanasios implied cupability on the part of the wife.

39. It is not clear as to which canon of St. Basil Athanasios is referring. See canon 25 of St. Basil (RHALLS AND POTLES, IV, 151).

40. V = 192v - 193v (*Regestes*, 1760). There are two canonical levels involved in this prohibition: (1) against any man marrying after ordination, see Canon 26 of the Apostolic Canons (RHALLS AND POTLES, II, 30); Canon 6 of the Council in Trullo (RHALLS AND POTLES, II, 320); and (2) against the ordination of men married twice, see I *Timothy* 3:2; Canon 17 of the Apostolic Canons (RHALLS AND POTLES, II, 22 - 23); Canon 3 of the Council in Trullo (RHALLS AND POTLES, II, 315). Civil legislation supported these prohibitions; see Justinian's Novels 6, 5 of 535 and 123, 12 of 546.

The priests' primary duty, Athanasios reminded them, was to teach the people, to see to their spiritual growth, and to keep them from sin. One didactic letter was essentially a lengthy catalog of the vices of a society in decline, albeit through the eyes of a moralist, and outlines canonical and scriptural prescriptions relating to doctrine, morals, the frequenting of soothsayers, witches, the eating of unclean food, sexual misbehavior, church attendance, fasting, and abstinence from strangled meat⁴¹. In another letter he declared that the duty of the local priest was to see that the instruction of young people was entrusted only to morally irreproachable men who demonstrated the qualities of justice, wisdom, and love of truth⁴².

In addition to giving general instructions to his bishops regarding the performance of their episcopal responsibilities, Athanasios especially concerned himself with the proper celebration of and teaching about baptism. He tended towards an ethical and spiritual understanding of the sacrament of initiation. In a letter he announced to the bishops that their first concern must be the proper teaching about «the mystery [sacrament] of the triple immersion» and especially making its meaning clear to the clergy in their charge⁴³. Athanasios, like many Greek fathers before him, interpreted baptism in a dynamic sense: baptism is not only an «event», it is also a «process» extended throughout the life of the Christian. As such the condition for salvation is two-fold: to be baptized and to live in accordance with that baptism. He wrote, for instance «Let us not lose the holiness which we have received at holy baptism»⁴⁴, and urged the people not to forget «to live according to holy baptism»⁴⁵, for «what grace is there to an insensitive infant

41. V= 225r - 228r (*Regestes*, 1777).

42. V= 210r - 211r (*Regestes*, 1766). The letter clearly implies that in addition to the fundamentals of Christianity, the secular arts and sciences would be taught.

43. V= 138v (*Regestes*, 1747): καὶ πρῶτως διδάξωμεν τὸ τρισσὸν ἐν τῇ καταδύσει μυστήριον τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος.

44. V= 223v (*Regestes*, 1776): μὴ οὖν ἀπολέσωμεν τὸν ἁγιασμόν. ὃν ἡγιασθημεν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ βαπτίσματι.

45. V= 224r (*Regestes*, 1776): πρὸς ἅπερ ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ βαπτίσματι συνεταξάμεθα ζῆν, μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε.

which goes through the holy washing but does not fulfil what belongs to baptism once it becomes a man»⁴⁶.

Relying on scriptural support, he explained its centrality in terms of ethical and moral behavior. Baptism, he warned, is not sufficient for salvation as some believe; only penance and good works can make baptism a reality in the life of the individual. The duty of the bishop and the priest is to teach the people how to live and to perform penance in proportion to the fault committed⁴⁷. Athanasios referred to the «mystery of baptism» as an obligation of both «word and work» (ἡμῶν ὀφειλῆς ἔργω καὶ λόγῳ). In fact, the conjunction of *logos* and *ergon* recurs in his letters as the basic principle of Christian life and the basis of personal and social reform. As an introductory remark to one letter, Athanasios noted that in consequence of the original sin which separated mankind from God, God taught that in the restoration of that primordial purity «faith without works is dead» (James 14: 17)⁴⁸. His fundamentally existential treatment of an essentially theological category, reveals Athanasios as a practical theologian, a theologian of the Christian life in the prophetic tradition of his great predecessor in the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate, John Chrysostom.

A thoroughgoing reformer, Athanasios clearly saw the Church as the vehicle of social and moral reconstruction of the people. Since the priests were to be the agents of this renewal, they first had to build up sound spiritual lives for themselves. The essentials of his reform efforts, whether in the Church or in society, whether social, ecclesiastical, or moral, were the same, and the same themes reappear with numbing repetition whether he was writing to bishops, monks, priests, or the general population.

46. V= 205r (*Regestes*, 1660): ποῖα γὰρ χάρις νηπιῶ ἀναισθήτω τυχόντι τοῦ θείου λουτροῦ, εἰ μὴ ἀποπληροῖ ἀνδρωνθέν τὰ ὀφείλοντα τῷ βαπτίσματι.

47. V= 136r (*Regestes*, 1747).

48. V= 133r (*Regestes*, 1747): ἔργων χωρὶς, τὴν πίστιν, νεκρὰν εἰπών.

Chapter VI

ATHANASIOS AND THE ARSENITES: A CASE OF ECCLESIASTICAL DISORDER

Any discussion of the Patriarch Athanasios and the dissident Arsenites is less a study in ecclesiastical reform than in ecclesiological heresy. In the eyes of the patriarch, the Arsenites violated canonical order and the very nature of the Church, and in his letters he treated them neither kindly nor diplomatically. Unlike Andronicos, Athanasios made no effort to win them back to the Church by compromise; in his famous letter to Andronicos he included the Arsenites in the five schisms in the garment of Christ and specifically attacked the emperor's having allowed them certain privileges in the hopes of winning them over to the official Church ¹.

As we have already seen, the Arsenite schism originated in 1265 when the Patriarch Arsenios was deposed for refusing to condone Michael's brutal usurpation of the Lascarid throne by blinding young John IV ². The Arsenite ranks were largely composed of monks, who were also opposed to the Union of Lyons, and lay people primarily from Anatolia, where the Lascarid house was popular for its charity and good government. Although one of Andronicos' first acts on taking imperial power in 1282 was to renounce the Union of Lyons and so reconcile the anti-unionists, he could do nothing, short of dissolving the Palaeologan dynasty, to appease the Arsenites. For almost thirty years of his reign, Andronicos would have to take the Arsenites into account in virtually all his political decisions, including those involving the military defense of Anatolia. The

1. V= 47v - 48r (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614); and Pachymeres, II, 168 - 170.

2. S. SALAVILLE, «Deux documents inédit sur les dissensions religieuses byzantines entre 1275 et 1310», *Revue des Études byzantines*, V (1947), 118; LAURENT, «Les grandes crises religieuses à Byzance: la fin du schisme arsénite», *Académie Roumaine, Bulletin de la section historique*, XXVI, part 2 (1945), 225; and JOHN SYKOUTRES, «Περὶ τὸ σχίσμα τῶν Ἀρσενιατῶν», *Hellenika* II (1929), 262 - 275.

Arsenites remained a disturbing religious and political opposition to the empire under Arsenios' successors Joseph, Gregory of Cyprus, John Cosmas, and Athanasios. With the election of Athanasios, the Arsenites were again foiled in their effort to regain power in the Church; and Athanasios was to prove intractable in dealing with them.

The Arsenites had wanted to regain control of the Church hierarchy, and prior to Athanasios' election had issued certain demands for filling the vacant ecumenical throne. Before they would submit to ecclesiastical authority, they demanded the election of an Arsenite, the dissolution of all previous excommunications directed against them, and the removal of Joseph's name from the diptychs «as an adulterer»³. Far from being goals of reform and asceticism, theirs seem to have been ones of purge and punishment. Such demands would have in effect established another schism in the Church by driving out supporters of Joseph, who had replaced Arsenios. Instead of reaching a settlement with them, Andronicos elected and enthroned the ascetic reformer Athanasios⁴. In principle the Arsenites were opposed to the man elected without their concurrence.

If Athanasios had no clearly defined attitude towards the schismatics prior to his coming to the throne, it soon became evident that he would not abide their insolence and sectarian attitudes within his patriarchate. What most irritated him, as well as such kindred spirits as Theoleptos of Philadelphia, was the anti-hierarchical character which the Arsenites displayed more frequently after 1265. As the events of its origins faded into the past so did the original *raison d'être* of the Arsenite schism; the movement became more a one of simple opposition to the official Church and the Palaeologan house. One author has correctly commented that

3. LAURENT, «Les grandes crises», Appendix 1, 286 - 287: Γράμμα τῶν Ἐηλωτῶν τὸ πρὸς βασιλέα, dated 1289.

4. Several modern historians of this period point out that very little is known of the Arsenite movement during the two patriarchates of Athanasios. Guilland, for instance, comments that Athanasios made no mention of them in his letters, but he is mistaken; see GUILLAND, «La correspondance», 133 - 134. Guilland did not realize that the term Ἐσλωταί in Athanasios' correspondence referred to the Arsenites. Athanasios devoted two extensive letters to the Arsenites and mentioned them in several others by implication; V = 100r - 105r; *Regestes*, 1737; V = 105r - 121r; *Regestes*, 1738.

Les Arsénites formaient avant tout un parti protestataire. Leur but était plus la conquête du pouvoir que la réforme de l'Église ⁵.

In the ecclesiastical sphere they took up the theological and canonical issues of the validity of ordinations performed by the patriarchs and bishops after Arsenios' deposition. Their condemnation implicated not only the hierarchical nature of the Church, but, it is learned from the Orthodox polemic directed against them, the very sacerdotal nature of the Church as well. Athanasios reacted against their sectarian affirmations: they did not recognize that the hierarchy and the orderly structure of the Church, in Athanasios' logic, were the source of the Church's internal freedom.

In addition, the Arsenites sought every occasion, every scandal, to rouse the people to revolt, especially in the capital, where the Mosele Monastery was headquarters for the moderate faction of Arsenites. Pachymeres recorded, for instance, that the Arsenites were the source of much dissension in the city and were continually stirring up the people and inciting them to trouble ⁶. Although none of their attacks on Athanasios has been preserved, one can well imagine that they seized on many of the same conditions which Athanasios was attempting to reform to prove that the official Church was corrupt and that only they represented ecclesiastical and canonical purity. The people, already suffering from great social hardships, and disgruntled at the sight of so many unruly monks roaming the city, were eager to join in anti-government riots. Hence, the Arsenites were not only a political and ecclesiastical movement, but a social force as well.

Andronicos' efforts to reunite the Arsenites during Athanasios' first patriarchate failed ⁷, and Athanasios remained one of

5. LAURENT, «Les grandes crises», 244.

6. PACHYMERES, II, 593.

7. PACHYMERES, II, 206 - 208; Andronicos' trip to Asia Minor between 1290 and 1293 was in part an effort to win over Arsenite opponents. Although during the two patriarchates of Athanasios not much is heard of the Arsenites, they are, however, met in at least two outstanding events of the second patriarchate: the council of 1304 and the conspiracy of John Drimys in 1305, which sought the restoration of the Lascarids and was hatched with the cooperation of the Arsenites; PACHYMERES, II, 595. See ИГОР ШЕВЧЕНКО, «Imprisonment of Manuel Moschopoulos in the Year 1305 or 1306», *Speculum*, XXVII (1952), 149, 156; this was the last attempt on behalf of the Lascarid element at rebellion, and the Arsenites began to lose their appeal.

their most redoubtable enemies whom they worked continually to undermine and finally depose. For his part, he consistently referred to them in his letters as «Zylots» (ζυλωταί). The definition and derivation of the word are unclear, but he seems to have used it as a perjorative epithet and a play on the word «zealots» (ζηλωταί), the term by which they wished the people to know them. Talbot suggests that it may be derived from the verb ζυλώνω, meaning «to rend» or «to tear», referring to the Arsenites' schismatic character⁸, but it may also have been derived from ξύλον, meaning «wood» and indicating either stupidity or stubbornness⁹.

Intolerant of a situation in which the slightest secular or ecclesiastical scandal was exploited as the occasion for a riot or a schism, Andronicos attempted to reconcile the schismatics by calling them to a synod in September, 1304. There he harangued them, insisting that the peace of the Church had been his «principal care» since he took the throne and thus implicitly accusing them of being the chief disrupters. In the end, his affirmations that he had done everything in his power to satisfy their demands were both pathetic and futile.

Andronicos' argument from the structure of the Church highlights the sectarian nature of the schism and outlines some of the Arsenites' weaknesses.¹⁰ «Show us your Church», Andronicos demanded, «or your bishops at least». The Arsenites' reference points were St. Maximos the Confessor and other monastics who seemed to have stood against the «official Church». Andronicos attacked this argument by affirming that Maximos was not outside the Church but in full communion with the Churches of Rome and Jerusalem which, with the exception of Pope Honorius, had maintained orthodoxy against the monothelite heresy¹¹. He reminded them that Arsenios did not even sign the excommunication against Joseph and

8. TALBOT, «The Patriarch», 29, n. 2.

9. I am indebted to Father John Meyendorff for calling this possible derivation to my attention.

10. We cannot discount the possibility that, given his initial influence over Andronicos during the early part of his second tenure, Athanasios largely determined what the emperor said at the synod.

11. PACHYMERES, II, 463; the Arsenite models were the monk-confessors of the past, such as Maximos and Theodore the Studite, who had opposed imperial interference in ecclesiastical life.

scorned their excuse that he had anthrax in his fingers¹². He attacked their condemnation that all ordinations after Arsenios' deposition were invalid and challenged them to demonstrate that any one of their number had been ordained by a bishop who was above reproach. Andronicos affirmed that only heresy could justify breaking the communion of the Church and that since in this case no question of doctrine was involved, obedience to the hierarchy was obligatory on all Orthodox¹³.

Andronicos' discourse, in its fundamental outline, presented essentially the same points made by the two contemporary anti-Arsenite polemicists John Chilas and Theoleptos, as well as by Athanasios in his more passionate attacks¹⁴. John Chilas in his *Discourse* against the Arsenites emphasized the essentially historical and visible nature of the Church, and the bishops as an expression of this nature; without the bishops there was no Church¹⁵. In addition, he reported certain information only hinted at in Andronicos' remarks before the synod. There were two parties among the Arsenites: the more moderate faction was suspicious of the priesthood and admitted of no bishops after the exile of Arsenios; the more extreme group, on the other hand, rejected all priesthood¹⁶. This was a logical position, since they refused to recognize any sacramental acts, including ordinations, which took place in the official Church after the deposition of Arsenios. Their source of authority and leadership seems to have been «spiritual fathers»

12. PACHYMERES, II, 468.

13. PACHYMERES, II, 470 - 471. SALAVILLE, «Deux documents», 103; Salaville concludes that since the major part of the Arsenite party was composed of monks that it was essentially a monastic movement and *as such* represented an anti-hierarchical trend which eventually culminated in the Hesychast victory. He further concludes that they represented «l'idéal d'une Eglise purement spirituelle régie par les charismes de l'Esprit et dont la hiérarchie visible ne serait qu'une institution purement humaine». This is a misinterpretation of the motivations behind the Arsenite movement.

14. For Theoleptos' *Discourse*, see SALAVILLE, «Deux documents», which includes text and commentary; also J. DARROUZÈS, *Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine* (Xe - XIIIe S) (Archives de l'Orient Chrétien, 9; Paris, 1966), 340 - 347. For large extracts of John Chilas' *Discourse*, see *ibid.*, 86 - 106. 348 - 413.

15. *Ibid.*, 350, 352 - 354.

16. *Ibid.*, 357, 363 - 368; John lists all the canons that apply against them.

who did not enjoy the benefits of sacramental ordination and the grace of the priesthood¹⁷.

Theoleptos of Philadelphia, who like Athanasios, insisted upon ecclesiastical order and unity, interpreted the Arsenites primarily as disrupters of unity and therefore sectarians¹⁸. His account offers a view of their disruption of the life of the Christian community and their efforts to stir up dissatisfaction among the people of the capital and Anatolia. His two discourses indicate that they scorned both the priesthood and the episcopate¹⁹. The Arsenites, he wrote, have as their aim «schism and rupture with the Church, aversion for the holy mysteries, and rejection of the priesthood»²⁰. Theoleptos insisted that the bishops are the descendants of Christ and without them He is not present in the Church. For both Theoleptos and John Chilas, the very nature of the Church was at stake in the Arsenite question. No modern writer has considered the party from the point of view of ecclesiological heresy.

Athanasios, no less hard on the Arsenites than John Chilas or Theoleptos, blamed them for the troubles of the empire and averred colorfully that they caused the world to be «flogged by God»²¹. In addition to all the other evils of the world «has been added even the things of the Zylots»²². The earth has vomited (ἐξεῖρψεν) up these people who «clothe the Church in rags» (ρακενδυτοῦτες οἱ πλεῖστοι) instead of building it up.

Athanasios was particularly concerned that the exploited and suffering people of the city, many of whom were Anatolian refugees with Lascarid sympathies, might be attracted by the Arsenites. But these were not the only means by which the Arsenites might increase their numbers; he charged that they «sneak around» (ἀνυπόπτως) among the sheep unnoticed and destroy the Church from within²³. He described them as those

who resist the divine will, monks for the most part, so as, after having hid themselves under the fleece of sheep and

17. *Ibid.*, 389 - 390.

18. LAURENT, «Les grandes crises», 275.

19. SALAVILLE, «Deux documents», 120.

20. *Ibid.*, 124 - 125.

21. V = 100v (*Regestes*, 1737): ὀρῶμεν ὑπὸ Θεοῦ μαστιζόμενον.

22. V = 101r (*Regestes*, 1737): προστέθεται καὶ τὰ τῶν ζυλωτῶν.

23. V = 101v (*Regestes*, 1737).

mingled with the sheep who pasture, to be able to destroy the flock of Christ . . . They concern themselves little with excommunication, with laws, with canons, or with interdictions which haunt schismatics ²⁴.

Theoleptos supports this claim that they were making converts from among the Orthodox and specifically charged that the Arsenites were encouraging the people to stay away from services, abandon sacred rites, and be insubordinate to their priests. He described them as falling into the error of the Jews, a reference to their rejection of the holy mysteries, an act which inevitably accompanied their suspicion of the priesthood after the deposition of Arsenios ²⁵. Athanasios himself wrote that the Arsenites tried to get the Orthodox to stay away from the sacraments ²⁶. Because they were guilty of apostasy, the most damning of sins, and because they led the Orthodox astray, Athanasios demanded that they be chased from Constantinople ²⁷. No wonder he attacked their admission to the city and their being granted in 1284/1285 the Mosele Monastery as a headquarters from which they were «capable of turning the Church of Christ and the tradition upside down by a savage audacity . . . » ²⁸

Athanasios, reporting a practice mentioned in no other sources for the Arsenites or even by modern historians, claimed that women played a large role in the sect and that monks even received the tonsure and communion from their hands. All of this, Athanasios warned, violated the canons ²⁹. Athanasios may have had the same abuse in mind in a cryptic comment that «the usage of deaconesses must be stopped» ³⁰. Although his specific objections are not apparent from the context, which is part of a general text on monastic reform, it seems highly unlikely that the patriarch would here condemn the existence of deaconesses in general since they

24. V = 101v (*Regestes*, 1737).

25. SALAVILLE, «Deux documents», 122 - 123.

26. V = 102r (*Regestes*, 1737).

27. V = 227v (*Regestes*, 1777): και διδάσκοντες ἀποστασίαν ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ,

ὁ ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίαν πᾶσαν, βλαπτικώτερον γίνεται ταῖς ψυχαῖς.

28. PACHYMERES, II, 169 - 170.

29. V = 102r (*Regestes*, 1737); Athanasios proceeds to detail the canonical violation in V = 105r - 121r (*Regestes*, 1738).

30. V = 137v (*Regestes*, 1747): και διακονισσῶν παυθῆναι συνήθειαν.

were most likely responsible for the social services for women in the city.

Athanasios wrote to Andronicos that he knew of several cases where people were returning from the sect to the Church. He implied that these men had originally become Arsenites for economic reasons and that they were now returning to the Church because it was no longer profitable to remain in schism. If they did return to the Church, Athanasios demanded that they not be permitted to return to those professions by which they had previously profited³¹. Although Athanasios' point is unclear, perhaps after the synod of 1304 and the failure of the Drimys' conspiracy, the pressure on the schismatics increased so that many marginal Arsenites found it more convenient to return to the Church³².

Pachymeres mentions that Athanasios took some unmentioned punitive actions (τιμωρία) in order to muzzle (ἀναχατίζειν) their propaganda³³. These unspecified measures were obviously unsuccessful, perhaps because the Arsenites had support among certain wealthy people in the capital and because Andronicos desired not to alienate them further. For Athanasios, this was the real scandal; he complained that needy faithful suffered while the wealthy gave money and support to the schismatics³⁴.

Since, for Athanasios, the Arsenites represented a fundamental political and ecclesiastical threat to the empire, he could not tolerate them in Constantinople, where they were not only stirring up conflicts, but perverting the faith of the Orthodox. So rather than trying to appease them he tried to discredit them, proceeding with a strickly canonical and patristic refutation of their positions, «for the security (δι' ἀσφάλειαν) of the faithful»³⁵. With the exception of his presence at the synod of 1304, Athanasios did nothing to bring about a reconciliation with the Arsenites. A settlement was, however, eventually reached in 1310 under the Patriarch Niphon. Its conditions embodying as they did the Arsenites' great distaste for

31. V = 81v (TALBOT, 109; *Regestes*, 1734).

32. V = 73v - 74r (TALBOT, 90; *Regestes*, 1722); it is not explicit that Athanasios was here referring to the Arsenites, but the mention of the fact that the group rejects the official Church would make it a reasonable inference.

33. PACHYMERES, II, 170.

34. V = 102r (*Regestes*, 1737).

35. V = 101v (*Regestes*, 1737).

Athanasios, testify that Athanasios had been a barrier to an earlier settlement.

The reconciliation was based on six points, all of which Andronicos and Niphon agreed to. The Arsenites dropped their traditional demand to be permitted to select the patriarch; implicitly they recognized the legitimacy of the Palaeologan house. Andronicos was no doubt relieved ³⁶.

The emperor and Niphon participated in a bizarre ceremony of union during which the corpse of Arsenios, dead for some thirty-seven years, clothed in patriarchal robes, was seated on the patriarchal throne; in his hands was placed a formula of absolution forgiving all whom he had excommunicated. Following the ceremony the emperor issued an imperial prostagma and two imperial decrees; Niphon issued an encyclical letter. All these documents proclaimed the end of the schism and the reinstatement of the Arsenite clergy, but did not demand that they recant their former errors. Athanasios most certainly would have insisted upon recantations; indeed, many Orthodox strongly opposed such leniency ³⁷.

According to Andronicos' prostagma, the conditions of the union included (1) the removal of Joseph's name from the diptychs ³⁸, (2) the rejection of all doctrine foreign to the fathers and Orthodox tradition, (3) the deposition of all those ordained by the unionist, John Beccos ³⁹, and (4) the expulsion of all simoniacs ⁴⁰.

36. LAURENT, «Les grandes crises», Documents 2, 3, 4, 6. Laurent has extracted and published the documents essential to an understanding of this last phase in the history of the Arsenite schism.

37. S. SALAVILLE, «Après le schisme arsénite: le correspondance inédit du Pseudo-Jean Chilas, *Académie Roumaine, Bulletin de la section historique*, XXV (1944), 183. Immediate peace did not result and many Orthodox rejected the settlement; Gregoras I, 261. Theoleptos of Philadelphia, for example, broke communion with Niphon and Niphon's successor, John XIII Glykys (1315 - 1319).

38. LAURENT, «Les grandes crises», Appendix II, 289 - 292.

39. *Ibid*, Appendix IV, 292 - 300; also available in Boissonade, *Anecdota graeca*, II (Paris, 1830), 70 - 76 = Λόγος Χρυσόβουλλος. The need for this may well be explained by the increasing pressure on Andronicos to seek Western assistance as the military position collapsed in the East. Andronicos' attack on the *filioque* indicated that the unionist controversy was yet current among the Byzantines.

40. See LAURENT, «Les grandes crises», for discussion of this condition. Simonical ordinations were one of the rallying points for Arsenite opposition, which

The final point of the settlement is perhaps the most significant to this study; it forbade the former patriarchs John Cosmas and Athanasios from ever again assuming the patriarchal throne. Even though such a possibility was highly unlikely, the Arsenites were no doubt delighted to have these two intractable enemies of their party formally excluded. The emperor approved these conditions, adding the canonical assurance that both John and Athanasios had left the patriarchate of their own free will and hence precluded any possibility of their ever returning ⁴¹.

Thus, Athanasios, the implacable foe of the Arsenites, ultimately fell victim not only to old age and discouragement, but also to the machinations of the Arsenites and to Andronicos' urgent need to establish both ecclesiastical peace and the legitimacy of the Palaeologan house. Athanasios' reforming zeal was limited by the weakness of Andronicos and the demands of political reality, although the patriarch did correctly interpret the Arsenites as a dangerous force against both the government and the Church. This understanding gave him sufficient canonical justification for his determined opposition to their continued residence in the city.

they used to attack the «official» Church. See also SYKOUTRES, *op. cit.*, III (1930), 42, on simony as an Arsenites issue.

41. LAURENT, «Les grandes crises», Appendix II, 291.

Chapter VII

ATHANASIOS AND THE REFORM OF MONASTIC ABUSES

In the process of the expansion of monastic influence in the Byzantine Empire, the resignation of Gregory of Cyprus and the elevation of Athanasios represents the triumph of the monastic over the secular clergy and the humanists. Bréhier has remarked that it «marquent une date important dans l'histoire du patriarcat et de l'église»¹. During the period of Athanasios' two patriarchates three aspects of monastic development are important: (1) monastic influence was increasing in the Church and ecclesiastical affairs came more and more to be controlled by monks; (2) monasteries, through large-scale pious donations of money and income-producing property, came to play a significant, even determining, role in the economic affairs of the empire; and (3) during this period of social and ecclesiastical decay, monasticism produced a reform school, represented by Athanasios, which would eventually assume the leadership of the Church after the victory of the hesychast party in the 1340's. Monastic institutions did not escape the patriarch's scrutiny; to him, monastic abuses of wealth and discipline had to bear much blame for the social turmoil and the decline of the empire.

Monastic Wealth

As Athanasios' letters demonstrate, considerable wealth remained in the empire, but in the hands of a few wealthy men and ecclesiastical institutions; that it was in the form of landed property was particularly significant since the empire's economy was largely agrarian². Among the richest land-holders in the empire were

1. LOUIS BRÉHIER, «Le recrutement des patriarches de Constantinople», *Actes du VIe Congrès international des Études byzantines* (Paris: Éditions Universitaires, 1948), 225.

2. NICOL, *op. cit.*, 115. See also OSTROGORSKY, *History*, 481 - 483; PETER CHARANIS, «Economic Factors in the Decline of the Byzantine Empire», *Journ-*

the monasteries, and they, like other land-owners, resented any encroachment on their exemptions or rights. In fact, they constituted «dans l'empire sous les premiers Paléologues, la seule véritable puissance économique». Andronicos, not to be numbered among the more confident Byzantine emperors³, never dared to tamper with the property or revenues of the Church, and so favorable legislation during his reign continued to place land and exemptions in their hands⁴.

Since the documents of the monasteries during the Palaeologan period are relatively numerous, we can form a reasonably accurate picture of the extent of monastic holdings⁵. With their holdings dispersed throughout the greatly reduced empire, the monasteries of Mount Athos were doubtless some of the richest⁶. The numerous documents or *praktika* of these particular monasteries provide copious information on the administrative and financial systems of these monastic holdings; for example, a number of relatively important land surveys, by verifying the rights of certain monasteries over territories and income-producing property, verify either taxes or exemptions by the controller of the fisc, the *apographeis*⁷.

Andronicos issued many chrysobulls confirming ecclesiasti-

al of Economic History, XIII (1953), 419, and PETER CHARANIS, «On the Social Structure and Economic Organization of the Byzantine Empire in the Thirteenth Century and Later», *Byzantinoslavica*, XII (1951), 94 - 96. These works cover the general growth of landed estates, both lay and ecclesiastic, and the legislation which after the ninth century was designed to limit the growth.

3. PAUL LEMERLE, «Esquisse pour une histoire agraire de Byzance: les sources et les problèmes», *Revue Historique*, CCXIX (1935), 280; HEIZENBERG, *op. cit.*, 25 - 28.

4. LEON - PIERRE RAYBAUD, *Le Gouvernement et l'administration central de l'empire byzantin sous les premiers Paléologues* (Paris: Sirey, 1968), 109.

5. LEMERLE, «Esquisse», 281.

6. GERMAIN ROUILLARD, *La vie rural dans l'Empire byzantin*, Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, 1953), 157; DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 1886. Well-preserved acts of the *apographeis* present some idea of the actual economic power of monasteries such as the Lavra of St. Athanasius on Athos.

7. IHOR ŠEVČENKO, «Le sens et la date du traité 'Anepigraphos' de Nicéphore», *Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques. Académie royale de Belgique*, XXXV (1949), 473 - 488. The widespread activity of the *apographeis* at this period is due largely to the wholesale loss of registers and documents of ownership as a result of political turmoil and invasions.

cal institutions and dioceses in their traditional holdings, several such confirmations being for the monastic houses on Mt. Athos⁸. Consider just two examples. By an imperial decree issued at Athanasios' request during his first retirement at Xerolophos⁹ the Monastery of Karakala was confirmed in its possession of six hundred modioi of land near the village of Kallistes on the Skymon river and numerous other holding and granted a long list of exemptions from taxes and imposts¹⁰. The monastery of Xeropotamou, with which Athanasios had a close relationship and to which he directed several letters of a purely spiritual content, was guaranteed, by numerous acts and ordinances, possession of its traditional holdings and was granted immunity from all fiscal vexations¹¹. These documents are extremely significant: they show the ecclesiastical sphere growing at the expense of, and concurrently with, the empire's declining control over its own territory and economic. Charanis comments that this monastic accumulation was not just a result of the empire's inability to manage its own territory, but was in fact the cause of much of the empire's economic decay and political disintegration¹².

In addition to the territorial grants, grants of fiscal and even judicial immunity (ἐξουσιοσύνη) increased significantly. All other immunities in favor of laymen pale in the face of those granted to monastic and pious institutions under the Palaeologan emperors. These concessions provided not only that the monasteries be exempt from taxation, but that even the peasants living on these lands be granted immunities and made totally subject to the monastic

8. ROUILLARD, *La vie rural*, 149.

9. PAUL LEMERLE, «Un Chrysobulle d'Andronic II Paléologue pour le monastère de Karakala», *Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique*, LX (1936), 431. The text specifically mentions that the reconfirmation is offered in honour of Athanasios; see DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 2166, also FRANZ DÖLGER, *Aus den Schatzkammern des Heiligen Berges*, I (Munich, 1949), 38.

10. LEMERLE, «Un Chrysobulle», 440; Lemerle outlines each type of exemption which applied to the house. See DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 2168 - 2169; also, GEORGE OSTROGORSKY, «Pour l'histoire de l'immunité à Byzance», *Byzantion*, XXVIII (1958), 165 - 254.

11. JACQUES BOMPAIRE (ed.), *Actes de Xeropotamou. Texte* (Archives de l'Athos, 3), Paris: P. LETHIELLEUX, 1964), documents 13, 14, 15; these documents deal with the significant holdings of Xeropotamou at Athos and Thessalonica.

12. CHARANIS, «Social Structure», 160.

owners¹³. As one might expect, so much property, wealth, and even manufacturing in the hands of ecclesiastical institutions, particularly monasteries, resulted in frequent abuses. Athanasios had to protect ecclesiastical institutions from the bishops' misuse of ecclesiastical and monastic properties since these lands and manufacturing concerns were fully part of the Byzantine economic system. Once they were in the hands of unscrupulous bishops or laymen they could be, and often were, drained of their incomes. The monks who controlled their own economic affairs easily lost sight of their vocations, and public officials, especially tax collectors, often abused them, withdrawing more than was owed to the fisc and appropriating the difference.

For Athanasios the evils of the age were due to a lapse of Christian morals and Christian discipline, especially in the case of monks and monastic communities, whose manner of life he sought to regulate. Repentance and reform being the only way to end God's justified wrath, the Church had to lead the way by reforming itself according to its own canons. But in the prevailing mood of power and wealth which characterized monastic institutions at the end of the thirteenth century, Athanasios' efforts towards a pure Christianity were not well received. Because of their wealth and investments in income-producing enterprises, monastic institutions aligned themselves with the wealthy landed aristocracy and tended to lose their religious identification, with its demands of poverty and obedience to which Athanasios repeatedly recalls them.

In this context of the Church's expanding influence and the monasteries' growing wealth, Athanasios spoke out as a reformer.

¹³. PETER CHARANIS, «Monastic Properties and the State in the Byzantine Empire», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, IV (1948), 65 n. 31; CHARANIS, «Economic Factors», 419. See OSTROGORSKY, «L'immunité», 165; Ostrogorsky records that the concept of *exkouseia* is a peculiar characteristic of the feudal order and appears under Latin influence. See also EMILIO HERMAN, «Ricerca sulle istituzioni monastiche bizantine: Typica ktetorika, caristicari e monasteri 'liberi'», *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, VI (1940), 370 - 375. Lemerle gives a detailed series of references to the imperial chrysobulls dealing with tenant farmers and the transference of services they owed to the state to the monastery on whose land they worked. LEMERLE, «Esquisse», 77 - 82; ANGELIKI LAIOU - THOMADAKIS, *Peasant Society in the Late Byzantine Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 11 - 12, 142 - 222.

His reform efforts fall essentially into two categories: (1) protection of ecclesiastical and monastic wealth from both secular and clerical officials and (2) condemnation of the corruption which this wealth brought about.

In principle Athanasios was not against monastic ownership of vast tracts of land and commercial enterprises; as has already been demonstrated, for Athanasios one of the elements of the freedom of the Church was the removal of secular control of ecclesiastical affairs, as well as the guarantee of financial immunities to ecclesiastical properties. He did insist, however, that this wealth be used primarily for the people, and in many letters he attacked those who misused ecclesiastical resources.

Patriarchal Jurisdiction

Athanasios' concern was not simply a pious interest in the purity and good administration of the monasteries; he was legally and canonically obliged to see to their well-being on every level. As patriarchal power and responsibility grew in the direct control of numerous monasteries, imperial power declined. This increased responsibility so broadened the realm of Athanasios' reforms that he saw himself as ultimately responsible for the monasteries within his diocese of Constantinople, the patriarchal monasteries, and the monasteries which had formerly been either imperial or autonomous and had now passed to patriarchal jurisdiction¹⁴. His rigorous asceticism as well as his immediate responsibility for monastic houses explains his many letters on monastic discipline; taken together, they constitute a rule by which he expected monks to live.

Formerly, in the case of imperial monasteries, the authority of the patriarch was respected, but did not necessarily make law. A new abbot, for instance, after receiving the benediction from the patriarch, received investiture with the pastoral staff from the emperor¹⁵. In the case of patriarchal monasteries, relationships were of a different sort. For example, many monasteries belonged to St. Sophia in the same way that some houses might belong to a bishop or a metropolitan. In this case the patriarch had all the «rights» that any other ordinary would have over them in sacred matters. In other cases, there were monasteries in the diocese of

14. HERMAN, *op. cit.*, 365.

15. *Ibid.*, 352.

Constantinople, such as those in the capital itself, where the patriarch had the same rights over the monastery as any diocesan bishop. Finally, monasteries situated outside the diocese of Constantinople and founded with the patriarchal blessing and authority, *stavropegia*, were independent of local bishops and metropolitans and directly under the patriarch, who exercised by right those functions which canon law granted to the local bishops¹⁶.

It is difficult to determine in which of these capacities Athanasios addressed his letters to various monasteries; in fact, the growing power of the patriarchate becomes obvious in this lack of distinction. In a chrysobull of 1312, Andronicos formalized this *de facto* patriarchal control over Athonite monasteries by declaring that all houses on the Holy Mountain were under patriarchal jurisdiction¹⁷. With this transfer of control, the patriarch was to appoint the *protos*, or the head of the council of the largest monastic houses. Well before this formal declaration, Athanasios had sent circular letters to the several outstanding Athonite houses, personally responding to complaints, urging elections, chastising malefactors, and offering a general rule for monastic behavior. The prerogatives had devolved upon him, not by law, but by necessity, since imperial power was no longer able to exercise this responsibility.

Protection of Monastic Property

Athanasios tried to protect the monasteries and their properties from corrupt secular officials, who instead of protecting the administration of monastic goods, and presumably the goods of certain charitable institutions, mixed unduly in their affairs and regulated them to serve their own financial interests. While an entire study devoted to Athanasios and his relationship with public officials would highlight his reforming zeal, it need only be pointed out here that he held Andronicos responsible for the behavior of these men. He reminded him in one place that it was not only his duty to fight heresy, but to see that men in authority behave cor-

16. *Ibid.*, 353; these consisted primarily of the right to ordain new priests and deacons, give his blessing to the abbot, and correct all spiritual abuses; also see ZEPOS and ZEPOS, I, 676 - 677, 680 - 681.

17. P. MEYER, *op. cit.*, 192 - 194, for the text of the Chrysobull of November, 1312.

rectly; the emperor, Athanasios wrote, was above all the «benefactor» and must chastise those who were not doing their duty justly¹⁸. In general, Athanasios condemned the interference of secular authorities, and in one place associated it with destructive ninth century attempts of the Isaurian emperors to impose iconoclasm.

In a typical linking of the themes of social and ecclesiastical reforms, Athanasios moaned that if the officials of the state were so bold with the things which belonged to God, how then would they treat the poor and simple people who have no one to defend them¹⁹. He complained that the monks, priests, or officials did not suffer, but the common people, who of all the classes in Byzantium were least able to bear the burden and who were without assistance²⁰. Specifically referring to Byzantine lay and ecclesiastical officials, he wrote that their love of gifts led them to devour the people as if they were pieces of bread. Athanasios wailed that if he could not protect the Church from such men, how could he defend these people «weighted down by injustice»?²¹ What they did dishonestly to the people, it seems, they were also doing to the churches and monasteries; another letter referred to agents of the fisc pillaging the goods of the Church and violating their legal immunity²².

At points in his correspondence Athanasios seemed to be reacting to the wholesale loss of territories in Asia Minor which had formerly supplied income for the patriarchate's administrative and charitable functions. Although the little that was left to the Church was yet large by comparison with the general poverty of the empire, Athanasios sought to stop any additional drains on the already limited resources of the Church. He wrote, for instance,

18. V = 62r - 62v (*Regestes*, 1716), for text see also GENNADIOS, «Ἐπιστολιμαία διδασκαλία τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου Ἀθανασίου Α' πρὸς τὸν ἀπτοκράτορα Ἀνδρόνικον Β'», *Orthodoxia*, XXVII (1952), 173 - 179.

19. V = 72r (TALBOT, 87; *Regestes*, 1719).

20. V = 9v - 10r (TALBOT, 17; *Regestes*, 1612). He here asked the emperor to stop the government agents from harassing the people. The same demand was repeated many times as, for instance, in V = 10v - 11r (TALBOT, 18; *Regestes*, 1679) and especially V = 16v - 17r (TALBOT, 36; *Regestes*, 1639).

21. V = 72v (TALBOT, 87; *Regestes*, 1719): ἀδικία πιεζομένων πινῶν.

22. V = 17r - 17v (TALBOT, 37; *Rebestes*, Appendix 7). Laurent dates this letter at Spring, 1303, before Athanasios' return to the patriarchate. See also BANESCU, *op. cit.*, 43 - 45.

«Since on account of my sins the Church has been stripped by a barbarian gale» and only a mouthful is left to her, Andronicos must appoint an overseer to protect the Church «so that the state officials may not mercilessly devour the property of the Church on my account»²³. Only with the establishment of such an administrator, wrote Athanasios, would the civil officials cease to abuse the goods of the Church. He implied that they will no longer have an excuse, that is, their personal distaste for him, for ignoring his demands.

Athanasios' prestige was at a low ebb. He no longer had any influence over any officials. They held a grudge against him, «because of the charges I make against them»²⁴. All respect, he claimed, had been lost towards the Church, and these unnamed functionaries were shamelessly exploiting and misappropriating her goods and property. He mentioned specifically that he had attempted to take action against a man who had stolen eighteen hundred modioi of wheat, but to no avail²⁵. In reference to such agents, who abused the Church's goods either because they disliked the patriarch or because of the desire for personal gain, Athanasios attacked Nicephoros Choumnos, claiming that Choumnos, for whom he had no affection, was among a number of high officials who made their fortunes by abusing their power²⁶.

The immunity which the Church enjoyed was so central to Athanasios' ecclesiology and his notion of the freedom of the Church that he placed violation of it among those sins which were the cause of the loss of Anatolia. He promised Andronicos, sometime shortly after the disaster of Bapheus (1302) and before his return to the throne, that the military situation could be turned about by controlling these dishonest fiscal agents²⁷. The assurance was timely, but not convincing since such military losses continued well into his second patriarchate. In another place Athanasios wrote, in the context of a discussion about episcopal residency,

23. V = 72r - 72v (TALBOT, 87; *Regestes*, 1719).

24. V = 72v (TALBOT, 87; *Regestes*, 1719).

25. V = 72v (TALBOT, 87; *Regestes*, 1719).

26. V = 17v (TALBOT, 37; *Regestes*, Appendix 7); much of this letter is actually a complaint against Nicephoros Choumnos; see VERPEAUX, *Choumnos*, 45 - 46.

27. V = 72v (TALBOT, 87; *Regestes*, 1719); V = 17v (TALBOT, 37; *Regestes*, Appendix 7).

If then your divine majesty wishes the Church of Christ to remain utterly free and untroubled in the spiritual sphere, in which men's souls, churches and monasteries dwell, and exempt from the (taxes) which are owed to the fisc, this would be immediately, pleasing to God ²⁸.

The second group of people attacked for their abuse of ecclesiastical, and particularly monastic, property were Church officials. Athanasios complained that these men were appointed to their spiritual offices not from among those who were the most dignified and worthy, but from among the highest bidders. In one letter he wrote to Andronicos that the iniquities of all the people, but especially those of the priests and the monks, were bringing God's condemnation on the Byzantines ²⁹. These men, particularly the bishops, were forgetting their spiritual vocation and occupying themselves with such private affairs as obtaining a higher rank in the Church and accumulating large sums of money.

Instead of permitting him to perform one of his chief duties to guard the administration of the monasteries and their incomes, the inmates of the monasteries themselves forgot for what purpose these houses were established; his duty, he affirmed, was to see that their administration was entrusted to people who were suitable according to the canons (*ἐγκανόνως*) ³⁰. No doubt speaking of lay officials who were granted certain income in return for administering monastic enterprises, he accused them of appropriating the wealth for their own purposes. Since the property of ecclesiastical institutions, including monasteries, was not in itself canonically inviolable and its use could be determined within canonical norms by the needs of the Church, the local bishops, or the patriarch for those monasteries under his jurisdiction, Athanasios' complaints were clearly justified. Not only were some officials unscrupulous, but their dishonesty so reduced monastic resources that Athanasios could not fulfill Andronicos' mandate to hear complaints and re-

28. V= 50r - 50v (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614). Since this letter was written in 1303, Athanasios still had significant influence over Andronicos, especially in the role of seer or prophet.

29. V= 17r - 17v (TALBOT, 37; *Regestes*, Appendix 7).

30. V= 68r (TALBOT, 83; *Regestes*, 1718); see Canon 49 of the Council in Trullo (RHALLS and POTLES, II, 423) for one example of the prohibition of the alienation of monastic property.

lieve injustices. Preferring to treat the property as their own³¹ the bishops objected to Athanasios' plan to use monastic resources, for example, to ransom captives about to be sold into slavery — a canonical procedure considered among the highest virtues by Orthodox Byzantines.

There was substantial opposition to the patriarch among almost all categories of citizens, especially among those monastic elements whom Athanasios felt were either abusing their way of life or the wealth which had come into the possession of their communities. Like the provincial bishops, the monks found the luxuries of the city far more attractive than Athanasios' ascetic discipline and his demands that they live in their monasteries. Neither, it may be assumed, did they like the idea of his confiscating monastic properties for ends that he thought fit. Athanasios was not, however, a blind defender of ecclesiastical property. Although he was jealous of ecclesiastical and monastic privileges, he sought primarily to protect them from illegal exploitation and theft by corrupt officials, not from what he judged legitimate use. As the empire collapsed, the emperor turned to monastic property for ready income for military needs and land grants to soldiers³² — with, as we shall see, Athanasios' approval.

Pachymeres recorded that the Byzantine military system at the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth centuries was collapsing as the soldiers had left their *pronoiai*³³; the Anatolian system of military land grants; consequently many soldiers had no motivation to fight to protect their own land. Pachymeres attributed the disintegration of the army not only to Andronicos' non-military manner, but to corrupt officials, who, distant from the capital, appropriated the land and salaries of the soldiers. Although the emperor had previously attempted reforms to counter this corruption³⁴, the reforming general John Tarchaniotes found, for

31. V = 12v (TALBOT, 25; *Regestes*, 1613): τὰ ἱερὰ βουλόμεθα ἐξωνήσασθαι.

32. See OSTROGORSKY, «Immunité», 228, 230 for a description of these attempts.

33. PACHYMERES, II, 390. «There were no troops to meet the enemy. The army was not only weak, but the soldiers, abandoning their holdings [*pronoiai*], turned to the west, trying only to save their lives».

34. PACHYMERES, II, 208 - 209.

instance, that the best soldiers had lost their *pronoiai* to those who could offer large bribes³⁵.

The emperor, having to raise money to fund the army, pay mercenaries, and settle soldiers on their own land, decreed that the proceeds from all ecclesiastical benefices, including the estates of monasteries, should be diverted to military purposes. The goal of this effort was clear—to restore to taxation those properties which had, by pious intention, been exempt from fiscal obligations.

Since *pronoiai* were traditionally considered to be the basis of imperial military power, Andronicos tried also to strengthen this custom. But lacking sufficient resources to pay the soldiers, he determined to take away the lands given to the churches and the monasteries and to employ them to pay the troops. Pachymeres wrote:

Because of critical times and circumstances, it appeared necessary to take the one measure still remaining: releasing from their overlords however much was given in *pronoiai* to the monasteries, the churches, and the imperial entourage, and to make everything, including even lands attached to monks who lived in single cells, into military holdings so that the people could defend their own property³⁶.

Such a measure, though desperate, was not unique; it was, however, the first time that it had been planned since the reign of Manuel Comnenos (1143 - 1180), when the needs of the state forced the use of monastic and ecclesiastical holdings³⁷. Consider the manner in which the rigid defender of the freedom of the Church responded to this scheme. What we see is not the unbalanced personality so often presented by modern historians. Athanasios did not oppose Andronicos' plans for secularization and Pachymeres recorded his gesture of approval:

Accordingly, without a word or action the patriarch sent an olive branch to the emperor, from which he was able to derive

35. PACHYMERES, II, 258.

36. PACHYMERES, II, 390 - 391. For differing interpretations of the meaning of Andronicos' project, see CHARANIS, «Properties», 56 - 58, who suggests that the passage involves the monks defending their own properties; and ELIZABETH FISHER, «A Note on Pachymeres' 'De Andronico Palaeologo'», *Byzantion*, XL (1971), 232, who notes that it is impossible to believe that a Byzantine emperor would call on monks to fight.

37. For previous examples, see IHOR ŠEVČENKO, «Nicolas Cabasilas' 'Anti-Zealot' Discourse: A Reinterpretation», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XI (1975), 154, CHARANIS, «Properties», 69 - 72.

some encouragement at good things [to come] because of his supreme confidence in the patriarch³⁸.

The patriarch was apparently willing to compromise in an area which, according to his logic, involved the freedom of the Church. Athanasios understood the primary need of the state, which in 1303 was for military survival, although there is no specific indication that he did so, it would not have been out of character for Athanasios to have inspired such a move. Pachymeres noted that, unfortunately for Andronicos' efforts to reform the army, this redistribution of land never moved beyond the planning stage³⁹; nevertheless, the «olive branch» incident increased opposition to the patriarch among the monastic communities, who would have undoubtedly preferred that he take a more rigorously canonical stand, as did the Patriarch Philotheos in 1367 when he refused a similar requisition on the part of the emperor John V⁴⁰.

The Patriarch Athanasios was a jealous guardian of the rights and freedom of the Church. With regard to monastic property he sought to protect it from misappropriation and abuse by both lay and ecclesiastical officials. He was not, however, blind to the legitimate uses to which this wealth might be put. He was also well aware of the abuses which monastic wealth had brought about among the monks of the empire.

Athanasios and Hesychasm

Athanasios' attempts to reorder the contemporary pattern of monastic life, which had been corrupted by wealth and social turmoil, expressed the same demand for «good order» which characterized his other reform efforts. It is interesting here to consider Athanasios as part of a larger movement for monastic reform since only in this context can we understand the claim that he is a presursor of hesychasm; that is, of hesychasm interpreted as a movement of reform⁴¹.

38. PACHYMERES, II, 390.

39. PACHYMERES, II, 390 - 391.

40. MIKLOSICH and MÜLLER, *op. cit.*, I, 507 - 508. Philotheos did point out that the emperor could take the villages he requested on his own authority since he had given them to the Church.

41. For a recent study in the meaning of the terms hesychasm and hesychia, see JOHN MEYENDORFF, «L'hésychasme: problèmes de sémantique», *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974), 543 - 547.

In the mid-fourteenth century St. Gregory Palamas referred to Athanasios and his contemporary Theoleptos of Philadelphia as being among the great teachers of hesychasm⁴², a designation which requires a deeper look at the nature of hesychasm. Traditionally, it has been interpreted exclusively as a psychosomatic method of prayer⁴³, but little in the writings of Gregory Palamas would qualify Athanasios as a precursor of hesychasm in this category. There are for instance, in Athanasios' letters no references to God's «uncreated energies», Divine Light, or psychosomatic methods of oration; his spiritual prescriptions, being direct, practical, and highly moralistic, give no indication that he was a forerunner of hesychasm or for that matter even a spiritual master. Hesychasm, as a distinct method of bodily orientation and prayer, may not have existed on Athos when Athanasios was there as a simple monk. St. Gregory of Sinai, a contemporary of Athanasios, who had been initiated into the method of monastic practice designated as «contemplation», as opposed to the active monastic life (*praxis*)⁴⁴, settled at Athos around 1300 and taught *hesychia*, which his biographer reports had been unknown there. If this is correct, we can safely assume that Athanasios was not a hesychast in the sense of the psychosomatic method⁴⁵, and we must seek a broader definition of hesychasm if both Palamas' reference to Athanasios and the content of the patriarch's letters are to be taken seriously.

Far from being an exclusively esoteric and subjective practice, hesychasm was a general movement of reform based on maximalism and Christian purity. Meyendorff has written «ce fut réveil spirituel qui touchait à tous les aspects de la vie chrétienne: la perfection intérieure, aussi bien que la vie sacramentelle ou le té-

42. GREGORY PALAMAS, *Triades pour la défense des saintes hésychastes*, edited by JOHN MEYENDORFF (Louvain: Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense, 29 - 30, 1959), 99.

43. MARTIN JUGIE, «Les origines de la méthode l'oraison des hésychastes», *Échos d'Orient*, XXX (1931), 179 - 185, and I. HAUSHERR, «La méthode d'oraison hésychaste», *Orientalia Christiana*, IX (1927), 77-94.

44. KALLISTOS WARE, «The Jesus Prayer in St. Gregory of Sinai», *Eastern Churches Review*, IV (1974), 5 - 6.

45. *Ibid.*, 12. See KVA, 71 n. 1, where Pantokratorinos refers to Athanasios' confessor at the Monastery of Esphiqmenou as a great hesychast with many famous students. The text of the *Vita*, however, makes no such reference.

moignage social»⁴⁶, a broader and certainly more viable definition of hesychasm which makes sense of Palamas' inclusion of both Athanasios and Theoleptos of Philadelphia among its great teachers. From both Theoleptos and Athanasios the basic monastic trends of the early fourteenth century can be described as strongly communal, sacramental, and ecclesiastical, oriented towards social reforms and interested in the affairs of Byzantine society. In the conciliar victories of the hesychasts in 1347 and 1351, Athanasios' maximalism and reform ultimately won out within the Church. It is therefore largely as an ecclesiastical and monastic reformer that Athanasios is referred to by Palamas as a «father» of hesychasm.

Monastic Decadence

Writing of what monasticism had been in the past, Theoleptos of Philadelphia noted:

But now it is the contrary which is practiced in the communities. Are the monks assembled at the church, at the refectory, or at the office? Their spirit wanders and their language prattles without value. And there is no one who reproves them. If some monk, taken with remorse, accuses himself before all the others in order to obtain forgiveness or so that some other of exemplary conduct will endeavor to remonstrate with the delinquents, he is laughed at⁴⁷.

Athanasios' letters also portray a time of monastic decadence - foot-loose monks, moral misbehavior, the abuse of excessive wealth, and weakened ascetic life. On the issue of monastic discipline, Athanasios remained intractable; his letters are a constant warning against the «laziness and sluggishness» (διὰ ραθυμίαν καὶ ὄκνον) which were common⁴⁸. A significant motivation for his social thinking no doubt derived from the cenobitical (communal) pattern which characterized Byzantine monasticism⁴⁹. Much of what con-

46. MEYENDORFF, *Introduction*, 39.

47. Quoted from a text of Theoleptos from *Vaticanus Ottobonianus Graecus* 405, fols. 93r - 105v in S. SALAVILLE, «La vie monastique grecque au debut du XIVe siècle», *Revue des Études byzantines* II (1944), 119 - 125. Theoleptos was the director of a group of nuns at the Convent of Christ, the Philanthropic Savior.

48. V = 258v (*Regestes*, 1640).

49. GEORGES FLOROVSKY, «Antinomies of Christian History: Empire and Desert», in *Christianity and Culture* (Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland Pub-

stituted his «rule» offered nothing genuinely new, being largely based on traditional conservative notions of discipline and obedience within the community, a pattern which in the turmoil of the period's social and ecclesiastical life must have spoken to the fundamental problems of exploitation, corrupt officials, and excessive monastic wealth. From its earliest roots, monasticism emphasized social renunciation; the monk as a stranger to the values of the world provided a pattern for all Christians. Athanasios seems to have desired to extend this vocation of mutuality and renunciation to the entire Church and even to Byzantine society itself, which he attempted to pattern after the monastic ideal.

Athanasios demanded that the monks withdraw from all normal social contacts, from attachments to family, friends, and wealth. In one encyclical letter addressed to all monks and nuns throughout the empire, he wrote that they were to practice poverty, live in humility, renounce all pleasures and self-will, and give up all relationships of friendship and family in order to keep company only with Christ ⁵⁰. He violently attacked those monks who «only cut their hair without at the same time renouncing carnal passions or the will» ⁵¹. We must not, however, interpret this position as contemptuous of the secular world; in his writing there is no millennial call for an escape to the desert. Athanasios stated quite explicitly that the monastic state was in no way superior to that of other Christian states and in fact second in dignity to that of baptism, which all Orthodox enjoy ⁵². Therefore, the call to sever all social ties in no way exempted the monks from providing works of mercy and charity or from sharing their considerable wealth with the needy in «the world outside». In one letter addressed to an abbot he wrote that the obligation of the monks to eat no more than once a day would save enough food and money to feed and care for a

lishing Co., 1974), 85 - 86. The fundamentally communal nature of Byzantine monasticism is highlighted by Florovsky with references to St. Basil the Great and St. Theodore the Studite (759 - 826); he associates «social reconstruction», one of Athanasios' themes, with the ascetic monasticism of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great.

50. V = 174v - 175r (*Regestes*, 1755).

51. V = 94r (*Regestes*, 1651): τὴν τρίχα γὰρ μόνην κειρόμενοι, οὐ συναποβαλλόμεθα καὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τὰς σαρκικὰς, ἢ τὸ θέλημα. See also V = 269r (*Regestes*, 1658).

52. V = 269r (*Regestes*, 1658).

substantial number of poor people in Constantinople⁵³. Athanasios was, however, aware of the special needs of the laboring brothers and allowed them to take a piece of bread and water at the sixth hour during the time of sowing, and to double the ration during the summer heat. He warned the brothers enjoying this to keep in mind that a little suffering is the source of great joy⁵⁴.

In spite of such attention to the daily life of these laboring monks, Athanasios' letters do not emphasize the monasteries as working communities; Florovsky, however, points out that this was fundamental to Byzantine monasticism and was «by no means a secondary or even subsidiary element»⁵⁵. Work was necessary, not only because idleness was a potential source of evil but also because it provided for the needs of the monastery and the community outside. St. Basil, the father of Byzantine monasticism, wrote, for instance, that «in labor the purpose set before everyone is the support of the needy, not one's own necessity»⁵⁶. Such an idea, while not explicit in Athanasios, certainly comes close to his actual programs of social and ecclesiastical reforms.

Finally, in addition to calling for service to the world outside, the patriarch's letters emphasized social mutuality, a concept fundamental to his thinking. A general letter of catechesis to the monks closes with a familiar theme: their purity is the salvation of the empire, and their fervent prayers will free the Orthodox from their current trials and the wrath of God⁵⁷. Another letter to the Athonite monks describes the current horrors and the consequent need for purity in their life. In an apparent attempt to arouse them to self-correction, he wrote, that everyday

priests fall victim to the sword, widows do not have time to cry, and the young are fuel for the fires; there is no longer

53. V= 259r - 259v (*Regestes*, 1640); the text of this letter is also published as «La catechèse d'Athanase 1er», in V. LAURENT, «Xéropotanou et Saint-Paul: Histoire et légende à l'ATHOS», *Revue historique du sud-est européen*, XXII (1945), 285 - 286. While the text is actually taken from *Vat. Gr.* 2219, fols. 258v - 260r, it is cited as coming from *Vaticanus Graecus* 2123.

54. V= 98r - 98v (*Regestes*, 1736).

55. FLOROVSKY, «Antinomies», 86.

56. BASIL OF CAESAREA, *Regulae fusius tractatae*, 42 in J.P. MIGNÉ, *Patrologiae Graeca*, XXXI, col. 1022. On monasticism, work, and charity see CONSTANTELOS, *Byzantine Philanthropy*, 88 - 110.

57. V= 260r (*Regestes*, 1640).

anyone to cry for the virgins or to deplore the sacrilege which profanes so many sacred things that are now subject to the impious⁵⁸.

Writing the inhabitants of the Lavra of St. Athanasios on Athos, he exhorted the brothers to obey the abbot and practice charity and humanity: in this way they sacrifice themselves, far from the world, for the needs of the Christian people, who hold them as ambassadors before God⁵⁹. Again he wrote that by faithfulness to fasts and prayers the nation would be saved from the imminent attack of the «atheists» (that is, the Turks), who have come upon the Romans because of their sins⁶⁰. And finally, in a letter to the *protos* of Mt. Athos, Athanasios reminded him that it was his duty to offer constant prayer for the nation, which now more than ever needed such intercessions for the emperor, the army and the suffering people⁶¹.

Double Monasteries

One of the monastic abuses which Athanasios attempted to correct was the existence of double monasteries. In double monasteries, an institution which probably dates from as early as the fourth century, monks and nuns were under the same spiritual director and, though separated, lived under the same roof or in buildings in close proximity⁶². Mixed monasteries, which were always forbidden in the Byzantine Church, sheltered men and women in common facilities⁶³.

Justinian's legislation suppressing double monasteries in the sixth century was ineffective⁶⁴, and in 787 II Nicea issued canonical regulations which prescribed that the monks and nuns live in separate buildings and that no new double cloisters be creat-

58. V = 242v (*Regestes*, 1604); the suffering, Athanasios assures the monks, is «from above» (= ἄνωθεν).

59. V = 252r (*Regestes*, 1618).

60. V = 96r (*Regestes*, 1651).

61. V = 240v (*Regestes*, 1590).

62. E. JOMBART, «Cohabitation», *Dictionnaire de droit canonique* III (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1942), col. 973.

63. J. PARGOIRE, «Les monastères doubles chez les Byzantins», *Échos d'Orient*, IX (1906), 21. Cf. also P. STEPHANUS - HILFISCH, «Die Doppelkloster: Entstehung und Organisation», *Beiträge zur Geschichte des alter Monchtums und des Benediktinerordens*, Heft 15 (Münster, 1928), especially 5 - 24.

64. JUSTINIAN, Novel 123, 36 in *Corpus Juris Civilis*.

ed⁶⁵. This was not sufficient for the Patriarch Nicephoros, who *circa* 810 completely banned the existence of such houses⁶⁶. After this, writes Stephanus-Hilpisch, «the consciousness of the Eastern Church accepted the concept that the double cloister is an error and an offense against the holy canons»⁶⁷. There were, however, two exceptions to this principle—the Monastery of Our Lady of Saidnaia near Damascus and one established by the Patriarch Athanasios⁶⁸.

The *Vita Athanasii* by Theoktistos speaks of Nea Moné, the monastery which the patriarch established on Ganos, as sheltering not only men but also «women who came to him to strenghten themselves»⁶⁹. In addition, the monastery which he had established at Xerolophos was most likely a double cloister where his male and female disciples lived separately⁷⁰. After Athanasios' death, his double monasteries continued until 1383 when the Patriarch Neilos I, after praising the virtues of Athanasios, broke up the Nea Moné into two houses because of certain unnamed abuses⁷¹.

The *Vita* does not describe the exact character of these two houses, but they do appear to have been double cloisters. Athanasios was well aware of the problems of any community where men and women lived in close relationship, and he specifically condemned sexual familiarity between monks and nuns, which we may assume, was not uncommon in a time of general moral and disciplinary decay⁷². Furthermore, referring to the conditions set up by II Nicea, he specifically attacked the existence of such houses in one of his general encyclicals. Even though Athanasios' allowance of double houses indicates a certain lapse from the rigor which he demon-

65. Canon 20 of II Nicea (RHALLÉS AND POTLES, II, 637).

66. *Vita Nicephori*, 4, quoted in STEPHANUS - HILPISCH, *op. cit.*, 20.

67. STEPHANUS - HILPISCH, *op. cit.*, 23.

68. *Ibid.*, 25.

69. TVA, 57.

70. TVA, 62, 65, 71.

71. MIKLOSICH AND MÜLLER, *op. cit.*, II, 80 - 81; see STEPHANUS - HILPISCH, *op. cit.*, 24; the author makes no reference to Athanasios' efforts to prohibit the establishment of any new double monasteries.

72. V = 56v - 57r (TALBOT, 77; *Regestes*, 1714). In one letter addressed to Andronicos, Athanasios reported that the abbot of the Monastery of Apaneia had been deposed for concubinage and the house subsequently attached to the neighboring monastery of the Theotokos, the Queen of the World.

strated in other areas, he absolutely forbade any new ones to be established. He wrote to all the metropolitans of the patriarchate that they must «not allow double monasteries to come into being (ἡίυεσθζι)» ⁷³.

Monastic Mobility

Gregoras reports that Athanasios' measures to restore the purity of monastic life included prohibiting involvement in public affairs. He chided the monks for failing to live a simple life, and for not travelling about, as was his custom, on foot.

He forbade them to travel unnecessarily, to appear in public places where they might encounter things harmful to their monastic vocation, or to visit wealthy citizens in order to collect money from them under the guise of pious zealots. Monks who did not respond to patriarchal chastisements were settled in dormitories in monasteries, where they were compelled (by what means is not known) to follow their monastic vocation strictly ⁷⁴. Others were driven from the capital and still other, so agitated at Athanasios' rigorous reforms, fled to the Latin monasteries in Genoese Pera across the Golden Horn.

That large numbers of monastics were violating the ancient requirement of *stabilitas loci* and were freely travelling about the cities of the empire greatly offended the patriarch. Much of this transportation was justified on the basis of the political turmoil of the empire, collapse of monastic obedience, and the increase of moral corruption. Too often the monks joined the long lines of refugees fleeing before the Turkish advances in Anatolia and then settled in Constantinople, where relative safety and even luxury were available ⁷⁵ and where their behavior was often scandalous ⁷⁶. While Athanasios was well aware of the actual danger from the Turks and Catalans who attacked and pillaged monasteries, he would not accept it as an excuse for the religious to leave the monasteries. He wrote in a letter to the monks of St. Paul-Xeropotamou that the excuse offered by many of the monks for abandoning their

73. V = 137v (*Regestes*, 1747).

74. GREGORAS I, 182 - 186.

75. PACHYMERES, II, 147 - 152.

76. V = 259v (*Regestes*, 1640). They caused great scandal by frequenting the homes of men and evenawomen (τὸ ἐλεεινότατον) in violation of their vows.

virtue was the «lack of necessities» (τὴν ἔνδειαν τὴν τῶν χρειωδῶν), due to the presence of the enemies (τὰς ἐφόδους τῶν δυσμενῶν) ⁷⁷. Whatever the cause of this monastic mobility, Athanasios found it intolerable and ordered all monks to confine themselves to their houses ⁷⁸.

Most significantly, the directive against monastic mobility appears in the *Neara*, a synodal decision issued in 1304 and confirmed as law by Andronicos after some revision in 1306. The *Neara*, among other items, forbade monks and nuns, who lived without a rule (ἀτάκτως), to roam about the cities or countryside of the empire; the disobedient were to be subject to the punishment of bread and water ⁷⁹. As is clear from his letters and the *Neara*, Athanasios did not limit himself to the abuses that were so evident in Constantinople, but attempted to make his policy against freely roaming monks general throughout the empire ⁸⁰.

Although Athanasios was vehemently opposed to the Turks in Asia Minor and to their religion, he saw the salvation of the empire less in terms of military victories than in terms of genuine social, ecclesiastical, and moral reforms. There is in his letters no hint of a crusading mentality or a call for a «holy war» against the invaders. Such a call would not, however, have been out of place given the intimate association between the *regnum* and *sacerdotium* in Byzantium and Athanasios' conviction that the empire was elected by God ⁸¹. Islam raised both a theocratic and crusading rival to Byzantium, which could not match its military zeal inspired by religious motives. In fact, Laurent comments on the crusading mentality that

rien n' a tant répugne à la mentalité byzantine, qua l'idéede

77. V = 258v (*Regestes*, 1640).

78. See for instance, V = 258v - 260r (*Regestes*, 1640).

79. V = 50v - 52r (*Regestes*, 1607). For the text, see RHALLES AND POTLES, V, 125; ZEPOS AND ZEPOS, I, 535.

80. In a letter of uncertain date, responding to correspondence from several abbots, he wrote concerning the wayward monk Methodios. He expressed his thanks at their obvious devotion to the canons in the problem of the return of Methodios to ecclesiastical obedience, saying he was especially impressed with their having balanced severity with mercy in their efforts. V = 270r (*Regestes*, 1780).

81. V. LAURENT, «L'idée de guerre sainte et la tradition byzantine», *Revue historique du sud-est européen*, XXIII (1946), 80.

guerre sainte; rien n'est si peu entre dans ses moeurs que la coutume de se battre pour un idéal religieux ⁸².

In the Byzantine religious and political tradition there was no crusading urge, either defensive or offensive. With rare exceptions, such as the battles against the Persians in the seventh century, no appeal was made to religious sentiment to inspire the people to do battle. In addition, there was the strong ecclesiastical prohibition against clerics fighting, even against an infidel; the Church and the clergy were limited to prayer for the nation ⁸³. In spite of the desperate military situation of the empire in the early fourteenth century, this prohibition was still strongly felt. Consider the case of the military adventures of the monk Hilarion.

Sometime around 1306 Hilarion a monk of the monastery of Peribleptos in Constantinople had been sent to see to the monastery's affairs in Bithynia. He was horrified, Pachymeres reported, by the destruction caused by the Turks and the failure of the government to oppose their attacks effectively. Without regard for canon law, he led a peasant fighting force and met the Turks in several battles. On hearing of his exploits, both his abbot and Athanasios firmly condemned his involvement, and Hilarion returned to Constantinople to defend himself. Pachymeres reported that the patriarch was unable to tolerate his behavior and issued a «grave warning» (ἐπιτιμημάτων σφοδρῶν) that he cease immediately. When the people of the region demanded his return, Andronicos finally conceded and sent Hilarion back to Bithynia, where he achieved some ephemeral victories around Brusa ⁸⁴. We do not know what became of Hilarion, but the patriarch stood firm in his opposition; no «olive branch» promised tacit support for the emperor's sending the monk back to Asia Minor.

82. *Ibid.*, 82.

83. Cf. Canon 7 of the Council of Chalcedon (RHALLÉS AND POTLES, II, 232) and Canon 83 of the Apostolic Canons (RHALLÉS AND POTLES, II, 107); Athanasios uses the term πόλεμος ἱερῶς to refer to the struggle against injustice; V = 7r (TALBOT, 42; *Regestes*, 1676).

84. PACHYMERES, II, 596 - 597. E. FRANCÈS, *op. cit.*, 69 - 70; Frances, writes that Hilarion was opposed by the high clergy and the landed nobility who looked for a quick Turkish victory and the stability it would bring to the area. Such an understanding hardly does justice to Athanasios' reforming zeal and devotion to canonical obedience.

Where ecclesiastical leadership did survive in Asia Minor it was the natural focal point for opposition to the Turks, and canonical penalties were not always pressed to their fullest in desperate situations; for example, neither Theoleptos, Metropolitan of Philadelphia, nor Niphon of Cyzicus, received ecclesiastical censure for successfully defending their respective cities⁸⁵. But in spite of some exceptions, Athanasios remained, as in the case of Hilarion, the rigorous defender of canonical good order.

Mount Athos

At least twenty of Athanasios' letters were addressed to the monasteries of Mount Athos. In one, referred to as a *didaskalia* and addressed in 1303 to the *protos*, abbots, and monks of Athos, he wrote to his «brothers» announcing his return to the leadership of the Church and assuring them of his particular affection for the houses of the Holy Mountain⁸⁶. He was particularly anxious for the well-being of the Athonite communities, and many of his general letters, which were for universal distribution, were actually addressed to them.

With the decline of the empire and the corresponding loss of monastic establishments in Asia Minor, the importance of Mount Athos as a spiritual center increased. At the same time the authority of the patriarch over the monasteries on the mountain also increased, thereby anticipating Andronicos' chrysobull of 1312, which transferred jurisdiction over Athos to the patriarchate. In one case, Athanasios' influence, as well as his reforming zeal, are evident in his handling of disorders at the Lavra of St. Athanasios; in this he took up one of the main themes of his reforms: «good-order» and obedience to established authority.

The affair which roused Athanasios' reforming ire began, according to Laurent's dating, early in 1304, when the monks of the Lavra demanded that a new abbot be appointed. Athanasios addressed a letter to the entire community - abbot, confessors, priests, deacons, monks and novices - in which, after an initial note of praise, he reported that he had received numerous letters

85. LAURENT, «Les crises religieuses à Byzance», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XVIII (1960), 52.

86. V= 235r - 235v (*Regestes*, 1590).

(δεξιόμενος γράμματα) not only complaining of disorders in the community⁸⁷ but actually seeking the patriarch's intervention. All these unhappy monks made the same point: many of the members of the community had rejected the authority of their spiritual father, the abbot Maximos, and were in revolt (ἐπανόστασιν). Athanasios warned them sternly that while it was human «to go astray a little» (παρεκτραπήναι μικρόν), disobedience was intolerable in the *cenobia*. Emphasizing the urgency of «good-order», Athanasios cautioned the inhabitants of the monastery that a revolt against authority was always disastrous. Anyone who went against the authority established by the emperor (ὑπὸ βασιλέως), that is the abbot appointed by him, was the author of his own destruction⁸⁸. This statement represented a key to the patriarch's thinking in the area of both ecclesiastical and social reforms - disorder (ἡ ἀταξία) is the result of evil, is itself evil, and is the cause of additional evils. As such, it cannot be tolerated in the monastery, which is to be the pattern for all Byzantine society. When disorder does exist it is because the monks are patterning their lives «after the mob» (τὸ πλῆθος)⁸⁹. The conflict continued, and in another letter to the inhabitants of the monastery, Athanasios accused them of willfulness⁹⁰.

This crisis of authority was possibly still current as late as 1309, when Athanasios addressed a letter to Athanasios Metaxopoulos, who had succeeded the interim abbot Gerasimos in 1306⁹¹. He reported that he had hoped for a peaceful solution and ordered Metaxopoulos to represent him in ending the disobedience since he could not be there himself⁹².

On the occasion of the death of the *protos*, the elected head of the council of abbots of the monasteries on the mountain, Athanasios again wrote to Athos. From Athanasios' description, the abbots did not immediately report the death of the *protos* to the emperor

87. V= 247v (*Regestes*, 1615).

88. V= 248r (*Regestes*, 1615).

89. V= 248v (*Regestes*, 1615).

90. V= 249v - 252r (*Regestes*, 1617).

91. For the chronology and details of this affair, which has been clarified by Athanasios' letters, see V. LAURENT, «La chronologie des higoumenes de Lavra de 1283 a 1309», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XXVIII (1970), 102 - 104.

92. V= 261r - 261v (*Regestes*, 1659).

and the patriarch as was required; in addition, they seem to have simply ignored the vacancy and held no election. This breach of monastic order could not be tolerated, especially at a time of secular turmoil when the empire needed prayers and righteousness. Furthermore, their demonstrated preference to live without authority placed them in grave spiritual danger; Athanasios reminded them, «a monk cannot even swallow water without permission». Because of their failure to act, the emperor himself appointed the new *protos* directly without their deliberations or consent⁹³. Thus in this instance, as in the case of disobedience to abbot Maximos, the patriarch's fundamental condition for monastic reform is evident - obedience to authority, either in the person of the abbot or in the form of canonical norms.

Monastic Regulations

In a letter to the abbots of Athos, Athanasios reminded them of their duty to see that the brothers observe the tradition of the fathers and the canons⁹⁴. They must, he specifically mentioned, follow strictly all regulations relating to fasting, obedience, vigil, poverty, prayers, and ordination. In the letter he emphasized that the abbots are to withhold priestly ordination from anyone who had not yet received the tonsure or who had not had the proper spiritual foundation; in addition, they must forbid anyone who had received the tonsure at Athos from leaving the monastery at his own liking. Any monk who at his own whim changed monasteries or installed himself in a secular institution was to be excommunicated, according to the canons; any exception must have the explicit permission of the spiritual fathers⁹⁵.

Another letter reminded the *protos* of Athos that by virtue of his position of leadership among the various monastic communities, he was the first teacher; accordingly, he must live in a modest manner so as not to cause any scandal among the brothers, and like civil and episcopal leaders he was to make no decisions out of

93. V = 261v - 268r (*Regestes*, 1657).

94. These references to the «fathers» are necessarily vague since in the Byzantine Church, in spite of the outstanding personalities of St. Basil the Great and St. Theodore the Studite, there was never a parallel to the influence of Benedict of Nursia and the widespread acceptance of his rule as a monastic norm.

95. V = 237v (*Regestes*, 1590).

consideration of gift, friendship, station, or relationship. If these qualities were not strictly observed at Athos, how then could they be expected in the secular world and the mountain be called holy? ⁹⁶

Besides these letters to the abbots and the protos, Athanasios wrote several outstanding letters summarizing the rule according to which he expected the monks of the empire to live. One, referred to as his «Spiritual Testament», was addressed to those monks who had been his disciples and lived in communities which he had founded ⁹⁷; in it he reminded them all of the rule he had given them when they were together.

But perhaps the most comprehensive treatment of his regulations for monastic life is to be found in the letter referred to as his *hypotyposis* (ὑποτυπώσεως γράμμα); of all those in the monastic dossier this letter includes the most comprehensive treatment of his regulations and provides a convenient outline for study.

Athanasios addressed the *hypotyposis* «to all those [monks] who lived in the entire empire (τῆς οἰκουμένης)»⁹⁸; if indeed Athanasios meant what he said in this address, then the content represents the first time in Byzantine history that a patriarch attempted to play the role of universal ordinary, taking monastic discipline in his own hands throughout the empire. The prescription that this particular rule be read in all the monastic houses on the first and the fifteenth of each month and on days of tonsure or any other major events makes clear that the letter was to constitute a regular feature of Byzantine monastic life. Like many of Athanasios' hortatory works, the letter is filled with tiresome repetitions and even babblings on his favorite themes - self control, fasting, and prayer ⁹⁹. Nevertheless, its substance may be divided into several categories of regulations:

1. *Liturgical services.* The *hypotyposis* required all monks to attend all the liturgical services; he wrote that «except in cases of serious illness or a need which cannot be avoided, the leader (ὁ προϊεστὴς) and the subordinates shall not leave during the midnight [services], matins, and the hours. During the Holy Liturgy, the ninth

96. V= 238r - 238v (*Regestes*, 1590).

97. V= 97v (*Regestes*, 1736).

98. V= 171r (*Regestes*, 1595).

99. V= 172r (*Regestes*, 1595). A monk is, he repeated, «a purified body, a cleansed mouth, and an illuminated mind».

hour, vespers, and compline, no monk must be permitted to lean on any wall; he must not walk or stand on one foot». So not only must the monk be present at the services, he must constantly be aware of standing before God¹⁰⁰.

2. *Meals*. Similarly, the *hypotyposis* regulated attendance—no monk may leave the refectory and the common table during the meal «without great need»—and conduct at meals. The emphasis, as in other letters, was on the communal nature of the meals. All the brothers must eat the same food (ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου ἑνός), and «no one should talk at the table, but should listen to the reading and fare sumptuously (κατατρύφῳ) on the illumination that it offers and with thanks glorify the One who gives all food»¹⁰¹. Both monk and stranger, whether religious or layman who might be living at the monastery, were forbidden to disturb the quiet, feasting community, either by calling out, making unseemly noises, or holding useless conversations. In one letter, the patriarch insisted that no one may miss a common meal without a valid excuse¹⁰². Again, in another place, he urged that no women be allowed to take their meals with the monks; transgressors of the divine commandments or heretics must also be excluded¹⁰³.

3. *Secret meetings*. Obviously associating such practices with stirring up trouble within the community, Athanasios forbade any brother to participate in secret meetings (συνομοσίχς = conspiracies). Neither may the abbot maintain close relations either inside or outside the monastery¹⁰⁴. Separation and equality seems one way heght to guard the community's integrity.

100. V = 172v (*Regestes*, 1595): Τῆς ἐκκλησίας νόσου βαρείας ἐκτός, ἢ ἀνάγκης ἀπαραιτήτου τὸν προσεστώτα καὶ τὸν ὑποτασσόμενον, μὴ ἀπολιμπάνεσθαι, μεσουκτικῶ, φημί καὶ ὄρθρω, καὶ ὄραις. Εἰ τόχοι καὶ ἱερά λειτουργία, ἐνάτη, ἔσπερινῶ, καὶ τοῖς ἀποδείπνοις, μὴ τῶ τοίχῳ προσκλινομένου τινός, μὴ τιμὴ δμιλοῦντος, μὴ τὸν πόδα κουφίζοντος. The same piety was urged on the monks in V = 252r - 255r (*Regestes*, 1618).

101. V = 172v (*Regestes*, 1595).

102. V = 253r (*Regestes*, 1618).

103. V = 225r (*Regestes*, 1776).

104. V = 172v (*Regestes*, 1595). He repeated this emphasis on separation in another letter, where he urged all monks and nuns to reject their families, avoid cliquishness (συμπόσια), and live only for God. V = 174r - 174v (*Regestes*, 1755).

4. *Fasting*. All the patriarch's letters addressed to monks emphasized fasting. These regulations, which were simple and clearly outlined, were to be followed strictly, especially during the four fasts for the Resurrection, the Nativity, the Dormition, and SS. Peter and Paul. In addition, Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays were to be kept strictly, under threat of excommunication, even when a holiday fell on one of these days, as was ordered in the Apostolic Canons ¹⁰⁵.

Athanasios complained that many monks no longer took these regulations seriously; they put on the habit and cut their hair, but still maintained the values of the world. Adam, he wrote, lost paradise by breaking the one rule of fasting, a breach which was symptomatic of a more fundamental corruption ¹⁰⁶. Some had even introduced into their *typonikon*, arrogantly and contrary to all rules, that the fast could be broken on the Feast of the Annunciation and fish eaten, even when it fell on Holy Friday: «They even eat fish (*ιχθυοφαγειν*) on Holy Friday on the argument that it is the Annunciation». He accused these men of being «servants of their bellies» (*δοῦλοι γαστρούς*) ¹⁰⁷.

Athanasios' regulations called for eating one meal per day during the five days from Monday through Friday, when they were not strict fast days. The food conserved in this way might then be distributed to the poor ¹⁰⁸. In another letter he established the same rule and added the exception of Saturday and Sunday. On Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, he added in this place, the monks and nuns must eat only dry foods and drink only water (*ὕδροποτεῖν καὶ ξηροφαγεῖν*), except in the case of grave illness ¹⁰⁹. In his «Spiritual

105. V = 93r - 93v (*Regestes*, 1651).

106. V = 93r (*Regestes*, 1651).

107. V = 95r (*Regestes*, 1651). In this notation Athanasios was referring to the possibility that Annunciation might fall on Holy Friday. Annunciation did not fall on Holy Friday during any year of Athanasios' reign. It fell on Holy Wednesday in 1293 and 1304; see GRUMEL, *La Chronologie*, 310.

108. V = 96r - 96v (*Regestes*, 1651); on the period of serious famine in the city and Athanasios' efforts to relieve the sufferings of the people, see KVA, 101 and ANGELIKI LAIOU, «The Provisioning of Constantinople during the Winter of 1306 - 1307», *Byzantion*, XXXVII (1967), 104 - 107. In V = 224v (*Regestes*, 1776), there is the same fasting regulations with the same exception for Saturday and Sunday.

109. V = 225r (*Regestes*, 1776); see ST. BASIL THE GREAT, *Regulae*, 19, col. 970, where Basil warns against dressing foods with expensive sauces.

Testament» to his disciples he called on them to eat only one meal per day (μονοφαγία) and then only after the setting of the sun; thus, he extended lenten fasting regulations to the entire year ¹¹⁰.

Athanasios' strictness with regard to fasting produced disastrous effects in the monastic communities. Deception became common. Some monks began to eat in secret, others at the sounding of the ninth hour consumed immoderate quantities of food, overeating to such an extent that they then had to drag themselves to the liturgical services in an indecent state ¹¹¹.

5. *The monastery's wealth.* The *hypotyposis* forbade any one from appropriating (παρανοσοφίζεσθαι) the goods of the monasteries, especially since such an action was forbidden by «our great father Basil» ¹¹². Revealing the practical aspect of his concern for too close personal ties, Athanasios warned that care must be taken that none of the goods or landed property of the house finds its way into the hands of relatives or friends of the abbot, who must be «dead» to the world, and no longer maintaining contact with his family. «It is a sacrilege (ιερόσυλον) to scatter the things of God to friends and relatives» ¹¹³.

Since it was common that many men of substance joined monastic communities, Athanasios upheld the fathers' condemnation of private ownership in the *cenobia* ¹¹⁴, and called on the monks «to be set apart and submissive, to cultivate fasting, watchfulness, and prayer, to be obedient and [live] without property» ¹¹⁵. On the contrary, no one could be expelled from the monastery because of poverty. In another letter, Athanasios took up the related topic of hospitality, which could not be refused to anyone who came to the house in need. He did, however, limit the extent of the stay to three days; but if the monastery could afford a longer period of hos-

110. V = 98r - 98v (*Regestes*, 1736). On the evolution of fasting in the Byzantine Church, see J. HERBUT, *De ieiunio et abstinentia in Ecclesia byzantina ab initiis usque ad saec. XI* (Rome: Corona Lateranensis, 1968).

111. V = 98r - 98v (*Regestes*, 1736).

112. See Canon 49 of the Council in Trullo (RHALLÉS AND POTLES, II, 423).

113. V = 173r (*Regestes*, 1595).

114. V = 173r (*Regestes*, 1595); cf. ST. BASIL THE GREAT, *Ascetica*, II, in J.P. MIGNÉ, *Patrologia Graeca*, XXXI, col. 881. Private property for SS. John Chrysostom and Basil the Great was of purely human origin and had no place in monastic communities.

115. V = 175r (*Regestes*, 1755): καὶ ὑπακοή καὶ ἀκτημοσύνη.

pitality, it was good to provide it since «it is needful to know how to give with joy»¹¹⁶.

Taking up the theme of administration in another part of the *hypotyposis*, Athanasios urged that when a brother was to be placed in charge of the goods of the house, he was not to be selected out of consideration of station, family, or friendship, but out of concern for piety, the only reason for any appointment within the monastery¹¹⁷.

6. *Travel*. To further insure separation and community integrity Athanasios forbade any brother to move outside of the house without the permission of the abbot; in fact the very idea of a monk's moving about was so serious that the abbot had to have three or four of the most pious brothers assist him in deciding to permit travel, and then only for business and only in the company of another brother, following the pattern of Christ¹¹⁸. Even the abbot must not leave the community without necessity. Athanasios, in another letter, affirmed the general rule that a monk must remain in the monastery in which he was tonsured. This practice had fallen into disuse and was especially ignored by the local bishops, who were responsible for its enforcement in the case of a diocesan house¹¹⁹. On Athos such a move from one house to another was permitted only with the approval of the spiritual father¹²⁰. He concluded that the problem was so serious that

if a monk runs away from his own monastery and transfers to another monastery, or ends up in a worldly resting-place, both he and the one who receives him are liable to excommunication until the run-away monk returns to the monastery which he wickedly left¹²¹.

If a brother left the monastery without the permission of the abbot,

116. V = 254r (*Regestes*, 1618).

117. V = 173v (*Regestes*, 1595).

118. V = 173r (*Regestes*, 1595). Mark 6: 7; Matthew 21: 1.

119. V = 74r (TALBOT, 91; *Regestes*, 1723). See for instance Canon 39 of the Apostolic Canons (RHAALLES AND POTLES, II, 54) on the responsibility of bishops to enforce monastic residence.

120. V = 237v (*Regestes*, 1590).

121. V = 74v (TALBOT, 91; *Regestes*, 1723). On the prohibition against taking up secular residences, see Canon 80 of the Council of Carthage (RHAALLES AND POTLES, III, 503).

it was the abbot's responsibility to go after him; if he did not, both were liable to spiritual punishment ¹²².

Athanasios' insistence on this particular canonical principle can only be understood in the light of the havoc these monks were causing in the cities. We know from Athanasios' early life that he travelled a great deal and made a series of pilgrimages from one monastic house to another. Byzantine custom did in fact permit such movement, except when such movement became a license for foot-loose wanderers or money-grubbing monks to exploit their appearance of piety.

The *hypotyposis* closes with instructions that the letter be read to the brothers regularly:

Once in the beginning of the month the shepherd [abbot], if he looks forward to judgment and reward, must order these things which we have drawn up for those who have been tonsured to be read before God, the angels, and men ¹²³.

Athanasios similarly ordered that the *hypotyposis* is to be read at the middle of the month; it must be the special care of the abbot to see that those who cannot read (*μη ἐπισταμένους*) have the rules read to them ¹²⁴. But Athanasios was not content with circular letters or even with letters that would be read regularly twice each month. In one letter, he announced that

we have judged it necessary to send brothers to each monastery each month so that they may read regularly and directly to your ears, because of forgetfulness, the acts and advice of our holy fathers . . . for awareness and fulfillment of what monks should do ¹²⁵.

In this clear parallel with his employment of clerical exarchs the reforming patriarch seems to take every measure possible to insure that the monks would return to and maintain the proper way of life as established by tradition. He reminded the abbot in each community that the spiritual father was ultimately responsible for maintaining order; they were the «caretakers of souls» (*ψυχῶν οἰκονόμοι*), whose function was to practice and teach everything that the patriarch had ordained. If the abbots failed Athanasios warned the brothers, he expected them to inform him, and only him, of

122. V = 173v (*Regestes*, 1595); also V = 253v (*Regestes*, 1618).

123. V = 173v (*Regestes*, 1595).

124. V = 173v (*Regestes*, 1595).

125. V = 175v (*Regestes*, 1755).

the violation. The man who hid these things from the patriarch was both a «hater of his brother» (μισάδελφον) and even more, a «hater of God» (ἡ ἀληθέστερον μισόθεον) ¹²⁶. Athanasios understood these regulations to apply to all monasteries in the Byzantine Church and not simply those which were patriarchal or within the diocese of Constantinople.

In a letter addressed to the abbot of St. Athanasios Lavra on Athos, the patriarch highlighted the essential responsibility of the abbot in maintaining good order; to do so he should follow closely the instructions he delivered in the *hypotyposis* ¹²⁷. In another letter addressed to the Lavra and accompanying his *hypotyposis*, Athanasios offered his aid to the abbot, warning him that if he is not strong enough to handle the job of supervisor, he must stand aside rather than harm the community. Placing a tremendous moral responsibility on the leaders of the Church and the monastic communities, he closed this letter with a quote from Jeremiah (48: 10): «Cursed be the one who does the work of God with negligence» ¹²⁸.

As in the case of Athanasios' reforms of episcopal abuses, there is nothing genuinely new in the content of the measures proposed for the purification of monastic life. No standardized rule, such as that of Benedict of Nursia in western Europe, ever existed in Byzantine monastic tradition; there was, however, a general pattern of life which had been defined by tradition, practice, and the influence of such outstanding leaders as SS. Basil the Great in the fourth century and Theodore the Studite in the ninth. Athanasios' regulations were, with some exceptions, traditional and represent the general trend of Byzantine monastic development, especially in their emphasis on the common life and the necessity of absolute obedience. Athanasios did, however, depart from this informal monastic tradition in placing almost no emphasis on the discipline of labor and in extending the rigors of the lenten abstinence throughout the entire year. Athanasios was innovative and even revolutionary in the extent and vigor of his monastic reforms and his attempts, unique in Byzantine history, to establish these regulations as universally valid and himself as universal ordinary.

126. V = 174r (*Regestes*, 1595); the same theme of the need to report all disorders to the patriarch is taken up again in V = 178r (*Regestes*, 1596).

127. V = 177v (*Regestes*, 1596).

128. V = 176v (*Regestes*, 1601).

Chapter VIII

ATHANASIOS' REACTION TO NON-ORTHODOX RELIGIOUS PRESENCE *

Athanasios was a vigorous ecclesiastical reformer. The same motivations which drove him to search out and attempt to correct ecclesiastical malfeasance also drove him to encourage the removal of all non-Orthodox faithful from within the walls of Constantinople. While the logic of modern sociological thought, at least in public affirmations and statements of principles, marks religious tolerance as a self-evident necessity for the survival of a pluralistic state, toleration was not so obvious a virtue to the medieval man. Athanasios was such a man. In fact for Athanasios, it was a self-evident anomaly to permit the residence of Latin Catholic religious communities of non-Chalcedonian Armenians, Muslim Turks, and Jews within the confines of the Queen City of the Orthodox empire. The purpose of the following section is to investigate Athanasios' attitudes toward these four minorities, his motivations for actions against them, and finally his suggested measures for dealing with them.

It has been traditional to trace late Byzantine anti-Latin sentiment to a monastic obscurantism and an unrealistic, self-destructive, political chauvinism. To this end, Laurent writes:

The overly long reign of Andronicos II (1282 - 1328) was in effect one of anti-Latin phobia . . . The wishes of the fanatics, who said they preferred the Muslim yoke to pontifical (papal) tyranny, were executed without delay¹.

Laurent refers to this as «une politique de suicide». Athanasios' correspondence clearly demonstrates, on the contrary, that anti-Latin sentiment, of which he was a spokesman, was based on a

*Much of the content of this chapter originally appeared in the author's «Athanasios of Constantinople: A Study of Byzantine Reaction to Latin Religious Infiltration», *Church History*, 48 (March, 1979), 27 - 48.

1. VITALIEN LAURENT, «Grégoire X et le projet d'une lique antiturque», *Échos d'Orient* 37 (1938): 272.

realistic evaluation of Byzantine political, social, and ecclesiastical life. The approximately two hundred letters offer a vivid picture of the empire in decay, the context of all his attempts at reform as well as his reaction to alien religious elements.

The role played by an Old Testamental sense of ritual purity is fundamental to understanding Athanasios' reforms in both ecclesiastical and social realms. The patriarch identified the Byzantine commonwealth with the true Israel, God's chosen people. Byzantium was the *corpus mysticum politicum* of Christ, of which the Orthodox faith was a constitutive element. He thus compared God's punishment of the children of Israel with the sufferings of the Byzantines at the hands of the Turks and Latins and applied Old Testamental conceptions of ritual purity to the Orthodox priesthood².

On this Judaizing influence in Byzantine thinking, Peter Brown has recently written:

The influence of the Old Testament upon the public image of the Byzantine Empire had grown steadily since the reign of Heraclius: the Byzantines were the «true Israel» . . . This evolution gave the Byzantine clergy what they sorely needed in a time of crisis. It provided them with a body of ideas that, to quote an anthropologist, «allows verbalization of anxiety in a framework that is understandable and that implies the possibility of doing something about it»³.

Although the reference is to the iconoclastic crisis (726 - 843), it can also be applied to Athanasios. In Brown's terms, Athanasios interpreted the turmoil in Byzantine life in Old Testamental categories, responding to it with prophetic calls for repentance and social justice in Byzantine life⁴.

The source of the sufferings was clear to Athanasios. He prophetically condemned all sorts of moral transgressions - homosexuality, witchcraft, blasphemy, exploitation of the poor - which

2. See for instance, V = 140r (*Regestes*, 1747), where he repeated the prescriptions of Leviticus 21:7, 13 - 15 and applied them directly to the Orthodox priesthood.

3. PETER BROWN, «A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy», *The English Historical Review* 346 (1973); 24. The anthropologist being quoted in Brown's text is CLYDE KLUCKHOHN, *Navaho Witchcraft* (Boston, 1967), 107.

4. See V = 48 (TALBOT, 69; *Regestes*, 1614), where Athanasios identifies himself with the prophetic ministry of the Old Testament.

provoked God's wrath on the Byzantine nation and even criticized the emperor's toleration of heterodox religions in Constantinople. The purity of the Orthodox faith was for Athanasios a fundamental condition of social order and political well-being, and he insisted that such religious aliens as Latin Catholics, non-Chalcedonian Armenians, Muslim Turks, and Jews be excluded from Constantinople⁵. Only by maintaining a two-fold purity of faith and morals could God's anger be turned away. As may well be imagined, he was less than popular among malefactors, dishonest tax agents, corrupt and money-mongering bishops, undisciplined monks, and Latins.

Athanasios' opposition to Latin Christianity was not merely an opposition in principle. He was well aware of the threat posed by the significant numbers of Latin Christians to the debilitated Orthodox population. As representatives of the superior military and commercial powers of the West, they were far more of a threat than the relatively self-contained Armenians and Jews. Even the Muslims, both Arab and Turk, aroused less hostility⁶.

Athanasios' attitude towards Latin Catholics reflected that of much of the Byzantine population after the Fourth Crusade. The Crusade and the ensuing Latin occupation of fifty-seven years formed the basis of future anti-Latin propaganda, which argued that it was better to suffer temporal losses than the loss of the Orthodox faith at the hands of the Latins. Even the Turkish conquest was to become an acceptable option for many faithful Orthodox Byzantines during the mid-fourteenth century. Such an attitude was understandably unpopular among Byzantine classicists who, less concerned about religion, looked for the salvation of the Byzantine-Greek tradition in the West. This hostility to things Latin conditioned Athanasios' opposition to both Catalan mercenaries in the service of Andronicos and the control of the Byzantine food supplies by Italian merchants. For Athanasios, the empire's salvation depended upon a renewal of ecclesiastical, political, and moral life.

5. Athanasios complained about the presence of these groups of non-Orthodox in several letters. See for instance V = 12r (TALBOT, 23; *Regestes*, 1621), V = 16v - 17r (TALBOT, 36; *Regestes*, 1639); V = 18r - 19r (TALBOT, 41; *Regestes*, 1622); and V = 31r - 32r (TALBOT, 46; *Regestes*, 1693). Athanasios used the terms *Λατίνοι*, *Ἰταλοί*, and *Φράγγοι* interchangeably to refer to Westerners

6. VITALIEN LAURENT, «L'idée», 83: «La seule haine que la masse grecque ait réelement éprouvée et que la littérature de combat ait réussi à entretenir fut haine des Latins».

The repudiation of the Union of Lyons by imperial decree in 1282 and synodal decree in 1285 represented a shift of imperial policy from a preoccupation with the Western threat to a desire to consolidate Byzantine social and political life. Of the Palaeologan emperors, only Andronicos II did not enter into union negotiations with Rome after the rejection of the agreement of Lyons at the Council of Blachernae in 1285 ⁷. Without doubt, Athanasios' influence over Andronicos determined much of his policy. According to Laurent, this reorientation resulted from Andronicos' superstitious nature and the presence of obscurantist monks, among whom he would include Athanasios, which encouraged Byzantine chauvinism and led the people to believe that their religion and their rites were superior to others. Whatever the personal pressures and psychological compulsions involved, the maintenance of Orthodoxy became synonymous with the restoration of the empire.

From Athanasios' letters we can isolate several sources of the patriarch's dislike for Latin Christians: (1) the Latins represented a threat through conversions and propaganda to the faith of the Orthodox; (2) there was still within Byzantium a pro-unionist party composed of scholars, aristocrats, and ecclesiastics seeking direct union negotiations and Western military aid; (3) there were yet aggressive military plans to reestablish a Latin church and empire in Constantinople; (4) the control of Byzantine food supplies and commerce by Latin merchants aggravated the decline of traditional Byzantine statist controls over provisions. Athanasios was above all a practical ecclesiastic; his opposition to Latins was not limited to theological differences. In fact, his correspondence is almost devoid of any theological content. There are, however, hints in his two *vitae* that he was involved in opposing the hated Union of Lyons during the reign of Michael VIII (1259 - 1282).

Prior to Athanasios' ascent to the ecumenical throne, Theoktistos, one of his biographers, records that during a stay on Mount Athos he fought the «devil's seed» which he describes as τὴν τῶν πνευματομάχων Ἰταλῶν αἵρεσιν; this is certainly a reference to the Union of Lyons, the *filioque* clause (one of the chief theological issues at the Council), and the efforts of the unionist patriarch John Beccos to enforce them on the Byzantine church. Theoktistos plac-

7. ANGELIKI E. LAIOU, *Constantinople*, 324 - 326; Andronicos II considered only one union effort just before the end of his reign in 1328.

ed Athanasios' vigorous opposition within the context of Michael VIII's persecution of the Athonite monks, who refused to acquiesce to the Union. Many monks fled from Mount Athos; Athanasios himself returned during the persecution to his former monastic house on Mount Galisios, where he described the «new heresy» (νεοφανοῦς αἰρέσεως) to the monks⁸.

From Galisios, Athanasios moved on to Ganos in Thrace, where he continued to preach against the *filioque* and the unionist patriarch John Beccos. While at Ganos, Athanasios was attacked for his opposition to the Union by one of the Latinophile bishops with whom Beccos and Michael were staffing episcopal sees. Arrested and sent under guard to Constantinople, he there faced the wrath of Michael VIII. The emperor himself vainly tried to convert Athanasios to the Union. He was physically beaten, his hagiographer recounted, and forbidden to speak against the Union. Eventually, and for some unexplained reason, the emperor had a change of heart and released Athanasios. He returned to Ganos and continued his opposition to the Union⁹.

In spite of this vigorous opposition to the Union, none of the patriarch's substantial correspondence dealt with the substance of the agreement of Lyons or with the *filioque* clause. But the letters do abound in anti-Latin sentiment and opposition to heretical beliefs. In a letter addressed to the discontented clergy of the Cathedral of St. Sophia, Athanasios attacked their earlier compliance with the Union¹⁰. Elsewhere he issued general anathemas against «all dogma, all doctrine which is not conformed to the prescriptions and dogmas of the Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church» and reiterated the proscription against Orthodox eating with heretics (μὴ ἐπιγαμβερεύειν)¹¹.

Latin ecclesiastical presence in Constantinople was nothing new. In fact, Latin churches date back to at least the end of the

8. TVA, 54. Athonite tradition has tended to exaggerate Michael VIII's persecution of the Athonite monks; see P. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 53 - 54; also see GERMAINE ROULLARD, «La politique de Michel VIII Paléologue à l'égard des monastères», *Études byzantines*, I (1943): 73 - 84.

9. TVA, pp. 51 - 42, 56 - 57.

10. V = 208r (*Regestes*, 1764).

11. V = 11r (TALBOT, 19; *Regestes*, 1680); V = 226r (*Regestes*, 1777); this is a traditional Byzantine canonical ban dating to the fourth century Council of Laodica, Canon 37, (RHALLÉS a,d POTLES, III, 206).

tenth century; the greatest number, however, date from after the so-called schism of 1054 in the late eleventh century when the Comnenian emperors began to grant commercial concessions to Latin merchants¹². Almost invariably these commercial treaties included permission to maintain churches for the Western merchants which were under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the home city¹³. Even after the Fourth Crusade and the establishment of a Latin empire and patriarchate in Constantinople, the Venetian churches remained under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Grado.

After the *reconquista* of 1261, Michael VIII needed both people to repopulate the capital and the expertise of the Italian merchants¹⁴. Both he and his son Andronicos entered into several treaties with Italians, especially the Venetians and the Genoese, who received the largest concessions and possessed several churches in Constantinople. Besides these two communities, there were smaller enclaves of Pisans, Amalphitans, Franks, Anconians, Spaniards and Provençals¹⁵.

By treaties of 1265, 1277, and 1285, the Venetians managed to recover the ground they had lost in Constantinople after the retaking of the city. The Genoese benefited from the very beginning, since they were, by the treaty of Nymphaeum (1261), allies of the Byzantines in their plans to recapture the city. As a result of three other treaties, the Venetians were permitted to maintain three dwellings and two churches which had belonged to them during the Latin occupation, St. Mark and St. Mary the Virgin¹⁶. During this period, the Venetians possessed a quarter on the south shore of the Golden Horn; Genoa was in virtual possession of the entire area of Galata-Pera across the Golden Horn from the capital, which is described by one author as having been «un véritable

12. JANIN, *Constantinople*, 247.

13. RAYMOND JANIN, «Les Sanctuaires des Colonies latines à Constantinople», *Revue des Études byzantines*, IV (1946): 163.

14. NORMAN BAYNES, «Introduction», in N. BAYNES and H. MOSS, *Byzantium: An Introduction to East Roman Civilisation* (Oxford, 1961), xxvii.

15. JANIN, «Sanctuaires», 176.

16. MIKLOSICH AND MÜLLER, *op. cit.*, III, 84-87. During the fourteenth century the pastor of St. Mary's Church functioned as the official notary for the Venetian community in Constantinople; see JANIN, *Constantinople*, 248 - 249.

État dans l'État»¹⁷. The Church of St. Mary was certainly in Venetian hands in 1295 since it was used for lodging by the ambassadors of Guillaume de Villehardouin while they were in Constantinople¹⁸. There were, therefore, several Latin churches in Constantinople during the period under consideration.

The recapture of Constantinople in 1261 had put an end to Western monastic establishments in the capital, but many Latin monastics seem to have returned during the last years of the thirteenth century. For instance, in the year 1299, the Dominican Guillaume Bernard de Gaillac managed to receive a house within the city from Andronicos for a Dominican monastery. Pachymeres records that Andronicos sold a house in Constantinople to the Italian friars (ερεμίτοι) for a residence in spite of the protests of the ex-patriarch Athanasios¹⁹. These monks were most likely Dominicans. Of course, when Athanasios regained his patriarchal throne in 1303, he demanded the return of this house to profane use and in 1305 the community was removed to Pera-Galata²⁰. Consequently Pera became the center of anti-Orthodox propaganda for the Dominicans, among whom an anti-Greek tradition was strong and calls for an anti-Greek crusade not unknown²¹.

In 1304 or 1305 Athanasios addressed a short letter to the bishops about Latin religious propaganda among the Orthodox. He called on the bishops to assemble with him, prior to leaving for their own dioceses, in order to draw up a series of petitions to Andronicos. He urged that something be done about the Latins «and the rumor that they are teaching with impunity, and are corrupting many of wavering (faith) . . . »²² The reference is not specif-

17. JANIN, *Constantinople*, 246.

18. J.A.C. BUCHON, *Nouvelles recherches historiques sur la principauté française de Morée et ses hautes baronnies* (Paris, 1863), I, 338.

19. PACHYMERES, II, 536-537. See also DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 2195.

20. PACHYMERES, II, 538; the angered Dominicans turned their hostility on the Pisan exarch for his role in the transfer.

21. ANTOINE DONDAINE, «'Contra Graecos' Premiers écrits polémiques des Dominicains en orient», *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XXI (1951), 321-388. It was the *Tractatus contra Graecos* written in Constantinople circa 1252 from which St. Thomas Aquinas borrowed some of the content of his *Contra errores Graecorum*.

22. V = 12Γ (TALBOT, 23; *Regestes*, 1621): τὰ τῶν Λατίνων καὶ ὕπως ἀδεῶς διδάσκουσιν τούτους ἀκούομεν. LAURENT, *Regestes*, 1621, takes τὰ τῶν Λατίνων

ic, and he may have been referring to several possible situations. Most probably, however, Athanasios was confronting an aggressive program of propaganda originating in the Dominican monastery of Constantinople. To the Dominicans, the Orthodox were fair game for conversion and/or crusade; Athanasios was well aware of their hostility and managed to rid the capital of their monastery²³.

Athanasios' distaste for the Latins and Latin Christianity extended into the affairs of the imperial family itself. Whereas Michael VIII had attempted a policy of military and political balance as well as ecclesiastical union, Andronicos II dealt with the West through connubial alliances, attempting to absorb all legitimate or quasi-legitimate claims to imperial territory by uniting Western pretenders to the imperial house²⁴. To this end, Andronicos married twice, each time to a Western princess. Andronicos' first wife, Ann of Hungary, died in 1281, and the emperor proceeded to make a fateful alliance with Yolanda of Montferrat, granddaughter of King Alfonso of Castile. This union returned to the empire title to the Latin kingdom of Thessalonica, which was already *de facto* in Byzantine hands²⁵. Yolanda was given the Byzantine name Irene.

to be a reference to Athanasios' fear of Latin propaganda from Byzantine supporters of the union. This is most probably a reference to Latin religious propaganda originating in the Dominican monastery.

23. GUILLAUM ADAM, «De modo Sarracenos extirpandi», edited by C. KOEHLER in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Documents arméniens* (Paris, 1906) 2, 548: quia eciam pertimescebat ne populus ad sanam doctrinam et vite exemplum fratrum nostrorum, Predicatorum scilicet et Minorum, converterentur, eos de Civitate Constantinopolitana expulit, et juravit in manibus monachorum quod numquam aliquem de predictis fratribus infra Constantinopolim permitteret habitare. Talbot, Commentary on letter 23, 330, assumes that the Latin monastery in Constantinople was a Franciscan (Minorite) establishment. PACHYMERES' references, II, 537 - 538, are too general to determine which order occupied the monastery. Adam, however, is more specific in referring to a double establishment.

24. For an excellent introduction to Latin-Greek mixed marriages during the period here considered, see DONALD M. NICOL, «Mixed Marriages in Byzantium in the Thirteenth Century», in C. W. DUGMORE and CHARLES DUGGAN (eds.), *Studies in Church History*, I (London, 1964) 160 - 172.

25. HÉLÈNE CONSTANTINIDI - BIBICOU, «Yolande de Montferrat, Impératrice de Byzance», *L'Hellenisme contemporain*, 2d Series, IV (1950): 426. For a fascinating study of Irene, see CHARLES DIEHL, *Figures Byzantines* (Paris, 1948), pp. 226 - 245.

Andronicos' fear of the West, which motivated this marital alliance with the house of Montferrat, was not an idle one, for Latin designs on the Byzantine empire were yet alive. The Western powers were not reconciled to the loss of Constantinople or the dissolution of the Union of Lyons. Though the crusading idea was largely bankrupt, the retaking of Constantinople was still discussed in France and Naples.

Michael IX, the first son of Andronicos by his marriage to Ann of Hungary, was proclaimed heir to the throne in 1281 and crowned co-emperor in 1294²⁶. Between 1288 and 1294 Andronicos vainly tried to arrange a marriage for Michael with Catherine of Courtenay, daughter of Philip I of Courtenay and granddaughter of the last Latin emperor of Constantinople²⁷. But in 1301 Catherine was married to Charles of Valois, the brother of Philip IV of France, who along with the Courtenay claims to Constantinople inherited the Angevin passion for Eastern adventure.

Andronicos' second wife, Yolanda-Irene, bore him three sons and a daughter, John (n. 1286), Theodore (n. 1288), Demetrios (n. 1294), and Simonis (n. 1293)²⁸. Unhappily for Andronicos' family life, Gregoras reported that Irene was imbued with a Western spirit and an ambitious jealousy of the privileges accorded to her step-son, Michael IX, who by Byzantine custom had priority over her own sons²⁹. Irene's plans were simple enough in a Western setting: to divide the empire into equal parts and thereby assure the equality and well-being of her children. She was, however, excluded from this objective by Andronicos' first son by Ann of Hun-

26. For a discussion of the date of Michael's crowning, see DÖLGER, *Regesten* 2061.

27. C. MARINESCU, «Tentatives de mariage de deux fils d'Andronic II Paléologue avec des princesses latines», *Revue historique du sud-est européen*, I (1924), 139; and G. BRATIANU, «Notes sur le projet de mariage entre l'empereur Michel IX Paléologue et Catherine de Courtenay, 1288 - 1295», *Revue historique du sud-est européen*, I (1924), 59 - 63.

28. PAPADOPOULOS, *Genealogie*, John = 61; Theodore = 62; Demetrios = 63; Simonis = 65.

29. GREGORAS, I, 234. «Unbelievable as it may seem, it was her [Irene's] desire that the sons of the emperor should not rule as sovereigns in accordance with old Roman custom, but partition Roman towns and lands after the Latin fashion».

gary. In spite of this, she persisted in demanding special privileges and honors for her sons, including individual patrimonies.

This conflict between Irene and Andronicos, which began with the crowning of Michael IX in 1294, was aggravated by the marriage of her son John to Irene Choumnos in 1304, a marriage which she regarded as beneath his station³⁰. But in a rare demonstration of determination, and in spite of his deep love for Irene, Andronicos refused her demands that he partition the empire, a demand which from the Byzantine perspective was inconceivable³¹. In a pique of anger, Irene left Andronicos and Constantinople and settled in her old patrimony, Thessalonica, where she made vigorous attacks on Andronicos and apparently even conspired against him with Byzantine dissidents who sought Western military assistance for the empire³². In a letter, Athanasios offered Andronicos the back-handed consolation that not much more could be expected from Irene, since she suffered from the arrogance of all Westerners³³.

On another occasion Athanasios introduced himself into the affairs of the imperial family regarding the succession to the Marquisate of Montferrat, which had fallen to Irene in January 1305 when John I, Marquis of Montferrat died. She and Andronicos clashed again on the question of which son would accede to the small Italian kingdom. Irene's determination to send her eldest son John as her inheritance infuriated Athanasios³⁴. He addressed a letter to Andronicos in which he vigorously condemned the plan by which «his imperial and divine majesty [John], is going to leave Byzantium in order to go to look for a kingdom among the Franks». Athanasios made it clear that his primary concern was for the Orthodox faith and John's soul:

30. CONSTANTINIDI - BIBIKOU, «Yolande», 425. Also see PACHYMERES, II, 379; and GREGORAS, I, 240.

31. Andronicos did offer Irene several concessions in the form of the right to grant certain privileges to her sons. See DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 2158.

32. H. MORAVILLE, «Les Projets de Charles de Valois sur l'Empire de Constantinople», *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, LIV (1890), 63 - 86.

33. V = 78r (TALBOT, 98; *Regestes*, 1648): και τὸ τῆς γνώμης καὶ τὸ τοῦ γένους κατὰ πάντα ὑπέροφρον.

34. V = 69r - 70v (TALBOT, 84; *Regestes*, Appendix 8); the text also appears in ANGELIKI LAIOU, «A Byzantine Prince Latinized: Theodore Palaeologus, Marquis of Montferrat», *Byzantion*, XXXVIII (1968), 386 - 410.

For who will dare to give assurance about the (young man) who is under discussion, that at such a tender age he will maintain his faith unblemished in a foreign land inhabited by barbarians and by an utterly insolent nation which has lost all sense? ³⁵

Andronicos must order his son John, as a master would his slave or a bishop his church, not to go to Montferrat ³⁶. In what became a traditional Byzantine argument, Athanasios cautioned Andronicos about sending John to the West in the hope of receiving military aid: «is it perhaps that we will expect from there some physical assistance» ³⁷. Over and over in his letters he emphasized that the empire would not be saved by assistance from the West. He realized, no doubt, that such assistance could be purchased only through the promise of ecclesiastical union and a repetition of the political fiasco of 1274. But ecclesiastical union in exchange for military aid was out of the question, and Andronicos could ill afford to risk the domestic consequences of such a policy. Moreover, Athanasios was firmly convinced that the empire could only be saved through repentance and divine assistance ³⁸.

Athanasios' involvement in such political affairs indicates that he understood the danger of Western aggressiveness. His religious and secular opposition to the Latins was neither an irrational phobia nor blind obscurantism but was based on harsh political reality. Latin aspirations for the retaking of Constantinople had both

35. V = 69v (TALBOT, 84; *Regestes*, Appendix 8): και άλλοδαπεῖ γῆ βαρβάρους κατοικουμένη.

36. V = 69r (TALBOT, 84; *Regestes*, Appendix 8).

37. V = 69v (TALBOT, 84; *Regestes*, Appendix 8): σωματικὴν ἀναμενοῦντες βοήθειαν.

38. Pachymeres records that, due to Athanasios' opposition, Andronicos forbade the entire project. Later, he suggested that Irene send their youngest son, Demetrios, to Italy (PACHYMERES, II, 598); as an apparent compromise, they sent their middle son, Theodore. Perhaps because Theodore was considerably younger than John and, hence, by Byzantine custom further removed from the Byzantine throne, Athanasios raised no vigorous objection to this arrangement. But as Athanasios had predicted, Theodore married a Genoese princess and declared obedience to the papacy; see ΛΑΙΟΥ, «Byzantine Prince», 379-401. GREGORAS, I, 244 and 396 reports that Theodore later visited Constantinople with a shaven face after the Latin custom. Theodore also encouraged Andronicos' only flirtation with ecclesiastical union; see H. OMONT, «Projet de reunion des Eglises greque et latine sous Charles le Bel en 1327», *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, LIII (1892), 254-257.

religious and political aspects, the latter more pronounced because of the commercial value of Constantinople as an *entrepot* ³⁹. The most immediate threat to the empire from the West came from Charles of Valois, newly married to the Latin heiress to the Latin kingdom of Constantinople, Catherine of Courtenay. Charles unrealistically desired a crusade for the restoration of a Latin kingdom and a Latin church in Constantinople. No doubt Athanasios was aware of the possibility of an Angevin crusade ⁴⁰, for the crusading spirit was not entirely dead in the West, and Rome even maintained a titular Latin patriarch of Constantinople ⁴¹. In addition, Pope Clement V in 1307 excommunicated Andronicos and gave the Byzantines the same status regarding indulgences as the infidels ⁴². Philip IV also received from Clement authorization to levy a 10% crusading tax in France and the two Sicilies ⁴³.

As Bréhier has commented, the first twenty-five years of the fourteenth century produced a number of theories on the best means of capturing the Holy Land ⁴⁴. In several of these plans Constantinople was to be the first stage in this new crusading thrust, since no other base of operation was left in the Levant after the fall of Acre in 1291. For example, in his 1305 *Liber de Fine*, the crusading propagandist Raymond Lull urged that Moslems, schismatics, and heretics be won over by well-trained preachers, perhaps Dominicans, even if their propaganda included coercion⁴⁵. He also proposed the capture of Constantinople from the Greeks, followed by a West-

39. LOUIS BRÉHIER, *L'église et l'orient au moyen-âge: les croisades* (Paris, 1928), 249.

40. PACHYMERES, II, 274, mentions that Boniface VIII crowned Charles of Valois as emperor, even though he had no empire to assume. See ODORICUS REYNALDUS, *Annales ecclesiastici denuo excusi ad A. Theiner* (Barri-Ducis, 1870), 1304: 29.

41. V. GRUMEL, *La Chronologie* («*Traité d'études byzantines*», Paris, 1958), 440.

42. REYNALDUS, *Annales*, 1306: 52; see also 1397: 56, where the pope urges Charles II of Naples to reconquer Constantinople for the Latin church.

43. BRÉHIER, *L'église*, 267.

44. *Ibid.*, 251; also STEVEN RUNCIMAN, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols (New York, 1967), III, 430.

45. For a full discussion of Lull's life and work, see AZIZ ATIYA, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1938), 74 - 94.

ern military advance across Anatolia⁴⁶. Shortly after this (1316 - 1318), the Dominican Guillaume Adam wrote his *De modo Sarracenos extirpandi*. Although Adam essentially described a plan for the retaking of the Holy Land, he envisioned the capture of Constantinople as the first stage in the process⁴⁷. In addition to the numerous and venomous complaints which he directed against the Byzantines and their anti-Roman religious policy, he noted that once in control of the capital, a Latin kingdom and a Latin Church would be reestablished. Fortunately for the Byzantines, infighting and national development in the West, especially in France, kept any crusade from getting off the ground. By the end of the thirteenth century «the crusading movement began to slip out of the sphere of practical politics»⁴⁸.

In addition to the theoretical threat of a Western crusade, several high-placed pro-Latin Byzantines (λατινόφρονες) provided a focal point for conspiracy. These individuals looked for Western assistance as the only means of saving the Byzantine empire from the Turkish onslaught and had little concern for the purity of the Orthodox faith. This sentiment was particularly strong among Byzantine aristocrats, including some ecclesiastics and classicists⁴⁹ and, as the empire degenerated, was particularly pronounced in the more vulnerable provinces⁵⁰. This desire for a crusade to assist the empire remained a constant in Byzantine dealings with the

46. RUNCIMAN, *Crusades*, 431 - 432; Runciman refers to Lull as «unpleasantly intolerant» of Greek Christians.

47. ADAM, «De modo», 553; Constantinople is described as a convenient point from which to occupy Anatolia and retake Syria.

48. RUNCIMAN, *Crusades*, III, 427.

49. See LAIOU, *Constantinople*, 218, where it is suggested that the Byzantine party encouraging Charles of Valois included Arsenites and pro-Lascarid elements. This conclusion seems improbable, in spite of Constantine Limpidar's comment that Andronicos was an «unnatural ruler». Laiou takes this phrase to refer to the fact that Michael VIII had usurped the Lascarid throne. The Arsenites, however, had too strong a tradition of anti-Latin sentiment and the Lascarid element too strong a tradition of opposition to Latin rule to join in Charles' plot. On the letter of Limpidar, see MORANVILLE, «Projets», 84.

50. CONSTANTINIDI-BIBIKOU, «Yolande», 246; also on the conspiracy, see idem, «Documents concernant l'histoire byzantine, déposés aux Archives Nationales de France», *Mélanges offerts à Octave et Melpo Merlier* (Athens, 1956), I, 129, where three Byzantine documents relating to the conspiracy are discussed.

West, as did the corresponding papal demand for prior ecclesiastical union before any consideration of military aid. Athanasios was fond of attacking the idea of Western salvation as a Byzantine self-deception which kept the emperor from genuine social and ecclesiastical reform. In a letter to the co-emperor Michael, for example, Athanasios repeated that victory depended upon virtuous behavior rather than military prowess:

I am grieved, however, at how our enemies always prevail over us, for no other reason than our own neglect and scorn for the laws of God, and for this cause alone ⁵¹.

Considering Michael's lack of military success, this may have been offered in consolation.

A Byzantine conspiracy in favor of Charles of Valois has been studied by Moranville. He mentions several prominent Byzantines involved in this conspiracy, Constantine Monomachos, brother of the governor of Thessalonica, Constantine Ducas Limpidaris, Governor of Sardes, and Theoktistos, Archbishop of Adrianople ⁵².

In light of the earlier conflict between Andronikos and Irene-Yolanda, it is interesting to note that a letter of 1308, addressed by John Monomachos, Governor of Thessalonica, to the empress informed her that a letter had been sent to Charles of Valois to advise him of the best means of winning the empire ⁵³. It is likely that Irene's implication in this conspiracy was based largely on her conflict with Andronikos and her desire to see a Latin occupation which would have assured the material well-being of her sons ⁵⁴. In 1308 Charles entered into negotiations with the Serbian ruler Stephan Uros II Milutin, who was married to Irene's daughter Simonis. Andronikos was to be the object of a Serbian-Angevin military adventure ⁵⁵. Unhappily for Charles all of his plans for the taking of the empire died shortly after the death of his wife Catherine of Courtenay in 1308. Moranville concludes with regard to Charles

51. V = 7r (TALBOT, 13: *Regestes*, 1610).

52. OSTROGORSKY, *History*, 495.

53. CONSTANTINIDI - BIBIKOU, «Yolande», 436; also Moranville, «Projets», 12, n. 5. Pertinent to this discussion are the documents appended to LAIOU, *Constantinople*, 341 - 343.

54. CONSTANTINIDI - BIBIKOU, «Yolande», 439; Irene seems to have ceased intriguing after 1308 and nothing more is heard of her. She died sometime around 1317, leaving her fortune to Andronikos; see GREGORAS, I, 273.

55. CONSTANTINIDI - BIBIKOU, «Yolande», 435.

that «rien ne lui a reussi»⁵⁶. With the collapse of Charles' plan, Western crusading efforts returned to the realm of theory for the remainder of the fourteenth century. This affair and the contemporary crusading plans of Raymond Lull and Guillaum Adam provide further evidence that Athanasios' distrust of the Latins was well-founded.

More pertinent to the social and religious well-being of the Byzantine people was Athanasios' reaction to Andronicos' employment of the infamous Grand Catalan Company of mercenaries. For Athanasios the folly of seeking military assistance from the West was self-evident. But military assistance was precisely what Andronicos was looking for in the early years of the fourteenth century during which the empire had suffered several major defeats at the hands of the Turks in Anatolia. Andronicos had attempted to reform a largely corrupt army in order to improve its performance, but these plans failed miserably⁵⁷. Almost all of Byzantine Anatolia had been lost to the Turks and Andronicos invited the Grand Catalan Company to come to his assistance. This seems to have been his only realistic option short of a call for a Western military enterprise based on ecclesiastical union with the Church of Rome, a strategy which, though virtually a constant in Byzantine diplomatic maneuvering since the eleventh century, was absolutely out of the question for Andronicos after the restoration of Orthodoxy in 1282⁵⁸.

In 1302 the treaty of Caltabellota ended the Aragonese - Angevin war, which had kept the Byzantines free from Western assault since 1282⁵⁹. After the treaty, large numbers of unemployed Spanish soldiers under Roger de Flor offered their services to Andronicos. Muntaner, the Catalan chronicler, wrote that Roger sent two knights to the emperor of Constantinople «to let him know that he was available»⁶⁰. Andronicos accepted Roger's conditions which included, among other things, marriage to the emperor's niece,

56. MORANVILLE, «Projets», 63 - 64.

57. PACHYMERES, II: 310 - 314.

58. GEORGE FINLAY, *A History of Greece*, 7 vols. (Oxford, 1877), III, 389.

59. LAIOU, *Constantinople*, 127 - 129.

60. RAMON MUNTANER, *op. cit.*, cxcix. PACHYMERES, II, 395 - 306. There is much recent and valuable work on the Catalans, see for instance RUBIO Y LLUCH, *Diplomatari de l'Orient Catala*, 1302 - 1409 (Barcelona, 1947).

the title of *mega doux* (admiral), a significant sum of money, and control over all the islands subject to the empire as well as the sea coast of Asia Minor⁶¹. Andronicos was enthusiastic about the agreement.

Athanasios, who had on several occasions demonstrated more political acumen than Andronicos, saw a potential catastrophe in this agreement, for it seriously compromised the integrity of an empire which should have been able to rely on its own resources for defense. In addition, the Catalans were not simply mercenaries; they were under their own leadership and actually sought to control territory formerly in the hands of the Byzantines. Roger and his men arrived in Constantinople in September, 1303, with an army composed of Catalans, Aragonese, Sicilians, and Calabrians⁶². The historical treatment of this unique band of warriors varies with the perspective of the historian. Finlay correctly observes that «their warlike deeds entitle them to rank as heroes; their individual acts made them a band of demons»⁶³. Contemporary Byzantine historians tended towards the latter interpretation. Immediately upon their arrival in the city, conflicts broke out between the Catalans and the Genoese over money which the latter had loaned to the former⁶⁴. Andronicos wisely moved the Catalans to Anatolia a few months later.

The situation in Anatolia was desperate. Pachymeres reported that when the Catalans arrived only coastal regions and interior cities were in Byzantine hands. He made a feeble effort to record the names of the many Turkic tribes which were occupying the area, but it was evident that the true magnitude of their conquests was not at all clear to the Byzantines. He did manage to list the names of some eleven tribes, among which was one belonging to Othman⁶⁵.

61. MUNTANER, *op. cit.*, cxcix; also see DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 2263, where it is dated at the end of March.

62. On the date of the arrival, cf. GEORGE CARO, «Zur Chronologie der drei letzten Bürden des Pachymeres», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, VI (1897), 115 - 116. The group is traditionally referred to as Catalans because it was composed primarily of Catalanians; its lightly armed infantry men, the Almogavors, were the most effective part of the band; see LAIOU, *Constantinople*, 134.

63. FINLAY, *History*, 391.

64. MUNTANER, *op. cit.*, ccii; Muntaner reports that over 3000 Genoese were killed as punishment for their arrogance.

65. PACHYMERES, II, 316.

These Ottomans came to be the most formidable threat to the Byzantines, strategically establishing themselves, according to Muntaner, directly «opposite Constantinople»⁶⁶. Refugees fled before the Turks to coastal regions, interior fortified cities, and, if lucky, across the Bosphorus to Constantinople. The suffering and horror they brought to Constantinople was taken by Athanasios as a sign of God's justified wrath towards the Byzantines for their sins.

The Catalans, in the short-range view, were a necessity. Emperor Michael IX had made a pathetic effort to hold off the Turkish onslaught and suffered a terrible defeat at the Battle of Bapheus (27 July 1302)⁶⁷. The Catalans arrived in Anatolia while Michael was yet held up in Pegai. Roger's men made quick work of large areas of Turkish-held territories, especially in the maritime regions⁶⁸. Their greatest success was the deliverance of the long-be sieged Philadelphia which, writes Nicol, was the only practical service they rendered to the empire⁶⁹. Hostility, however, developed between Roger and Michael and their respective troops, and Michael left Pegai «full of hatred against the Catalans»⁷⁰.

Athanasios represented a more serious opposition to the Catalans. His letters demonstrate that he had news of Roger's men maiming the Byzantine population of Anatolia. He outlines their successes, but he also lists their atrocities. In spite of their successes, he urged Andronicos not to rely on foreign armies; even if «all the West united itself to help us, it would do nothing for us»⁷¹. Athanasios was angered by Andronicos' refusal to heed his warnings regarding the Catalans⁷². He disliked the Catalans not only for their Western faith, which he feared would be forced upon the Orthodox

66. MUNTANER, *op. cit.*, ccii, reports that they would have taken Constantinople had they had ships available.

67. PACHYMERES, II, 388, 410, 412.

68. ERWIN DADE, *Versuche zur Wiedererrichtung der latinischen Herrschaft in Konstantinopel in Rahmen der abendländischen Politik* (Jena, 1938), Part II, 2, 7.

69. NICOL, *op. cit.*, 136.

70. PACHYMERES, 2, 288: on leaving the city, Michael bitterly ordered the inhabitants not to admit Roger.

71. V = 3v (TALBOT, 3; *Regestes*, 1673); cf. BANESCU, «Athanasios», 43.

72. V = 16v (TALBOT, 35; *Regestes*, 1630). Pachymeres repeats the charge that Andronicos refused to heed Athanasios' warnings regarding the Catalans; see PACHYMERES, II, 399 - 400.

people, but because of what they represented in terms of a solution to the Byzantine predicament. Military might was not what was needed; he looked rather to repentance and social justice to win God's pleasure. In addition, it soon became evident that any benefits the Catalans brought to the empire were not only ephemeral but were severely limited by their plundering of the people they were hired to protect. In addition, Athanasios may have suspected that the Catalans were an advance guard for a Western drive against the empire ⁷³.

Soon after their arrival in the empire, sometime in the winter of 1303 - 1304, Athanasios warned Andronicos of the danger which the Catalans presented. In a letter praising Andronicos for ending the hated Union of Lyons, he wrote,

It is impossible to describe the reward that lies in store for your divine majesty for the efforts which you, after the Lord, have exerted to purge the Church from communion with the Italians ⁷⁴.

He then urged Andronicos not to relax but rather to send Orthodox priests and teachers with Roger and his men so that the people would not have to commune with the Latins. He elsewhere urged Andronicos that, like Moses and the Egyptians, he should «deliver the Orthodox people from the grim tyranny of the Sicilian», whom he refers to as the proverbial «wolf» ⁷⁵. In yet another letter, Athanasios wrote of the suffering of the urban population, especially the refugees who «escape half-dead from the Ishmaelites and the Italians [probably the Catalans]», and whose «plight would bring tears even to a Jew» ⁷⁶. Eventually, Andronicos realized that the Catalans were a liability and recalled Roger from Anatolia on the pretext of assisting Michael IX against the Bulgars. On their return, Ro-

73. See note 77.

74. V = 6r (TALBOT, 9; *Regestes*, 1594): τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καθάραι συγκατανομίαις τῶν Ἰταλῶν.

75. V = 76r (TALBOT, 94; *Regestes*, 1608): λύκος ἀπελεγχθήτω is just one of the terms Athanasios used for the Catalans; on the use of the term «Sicilian», see TALBOT, Commentary on letter 94.

76. V = 31r (TALBOT, 46; *Regestes*, 1693). TALBOT, Commentary on Letter 46, believes that Ἰταλῶν in this letter is reference either to Genoese, Venetians, or Catalans. It is most probably a reference to the Catalans, who, along with the Turks, were inflicting great suffering on the Byzantine Anatolian population.

ger occupied the Gallipoli peninsula, which Andronicos accepted as a *fait accompli* in the summer of 1304.

In addition to their plundering and the threat of conversion, the Catalans represented a tremendous financial strain on the empire. They were, after all, mercenaries. In early autumn, 1304, Roger demanded payment in compensation for booty lost when the Byzantine population locked them out of Magnesia. Money was not readily available, and Andronicos was forced to institute a new tax, the *sitokrithon* (σιτόκριθόν). The emperor ordered that every peasant give six *modioi* of wheat and four of barley to the treasury. In addition, one-third of the salary of every Byzantine official was deducted to meet the Catalan demands⁷⁷. Pachymeres recorded that early in 1305 when the emperor was trying to raise 100,000 *modioi* of grain for the Catalans, both imperial and Catalan agents were put to the task of making the collection⁷⁸. Athanasios agreed that taxes had to be collected, but he insisted that the «blood-thirsty» Catalans must not be allowed to collect them⁷⁹. More serious was Andronicos' effort to palm off a debased silver coinage as pay on Roger's men. This move backfired when the cheaper money was eventually passed on to Byzantine merchants, people, and the imperial fisc⁸⁰. When Roger discovered that he had been paid with inferior coinage, he demanded even more compensation, which placed an even greater strain on the Byzantine population.

Andronicos made another effort to rid himself of Roger by transferring him back to Anatolia to relieve Philadelphia, once again besieged by the Turks. In exchange for returning to Anatolia, Roger was to receive the title of Cesar and full authority to govern Asia Minor with the exception of the large cities⁸¹. In fact,

77. PACHYMERES, II, 349; GREGORAS, I, 220.

78. PACHYMERES, II, 522 - 523.

79. V = 47r (TALBOT, 68; *Regestes*, 1624).

80. MUNTANER, *op. cit.*, ccx; PACHYMERES, II, 493 - 494; ZAKYTHINOS, *Crise*, 8 - 10, 18 - 19. On this new coin, which was apparently produced in a face value and a debased edition, see V. LAURENT, «Le basilicon: nouveau nom de monnaie sous Andronic II Paléologue», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XLV (1925), 50 - 58. Laurent suggests that Andronicos had planned to rouse the Byzantine people against the Catalans who would be passing on inferior coinage to general public.

81. PACHYMERES, II, 506 (= στρατηγός ἀποτοράτωρ); cf. DÖLGER, *Regesten* 2277.

all Andronicos did was to give Roger possession of any territory he could wrest from the Turks and nothing more. Roger accepted a compromised indemnity payment in satisfaction of his previous claims.

What complicated life significantly for the already beleaguered empire was Roger's unexplained decision to visit the embittered Michael IX in Adrianople. Unfortunately for the peace of the empire, Roger was assassinated by one of Michael's Alan troops, whose son had previously been killed in Roger's attack on Cyzicus⁸². Three of Roger's men escaped the ensuing massacre of Catalans and carried the news back to Gallipoli. Berengar de Rocafort promptly assumed leadership and announced that all ties of allegiance to Andronicos were terminated and the territory of the empire was now subject to plunder. For two years Thrace was ravaged by the Catalans, who encountered almost no opposition from imperial troops. The Catalans and their Turkish allies beseiged Constantinople, painfully revealing the full extent of imperial impotence, and occasioning civil disorders in the capital in May 1305. Andronicos' unwise dissolution of the Byzantine fleet early in his reign now became an explosive issue in terms of his inability either to defend or to provision his capital. Near riots broke out in the city among the people «because it was not possible for them to live in security unless ships were armed according to the old customs of the Romans»⁸³. It was clear to many that, from an economic point of view, the Byzantines should go into the shipping business themselves and recapture the grain trade. The Genoese fleet which the Byzantines previously had relied upon for defense was unavailable during the Catalan siege as the Genoese had made peace with the mercenaries in exchange for freedom to navigate the Hellespont and Propontis⁸⁴. In spite of Athanasios' efforts to defend Andronicos and to assure the people that justice would be done, an anti-Latin riot broke out with both Genoese and Catalans as the object of popular hatred.

Andronicos made no attempt to defend the countryside where,

82. PACHYMERES, II, 525; Gregoras, I, 223 - 224; MUNTANER, *op. cit.*, ccxiii, ccv, ccxv.

83. PACHYMERES, II, 531 - 533; cf. also LAIOU, *Constantinople*, pp. 164 - 165.

84. PACHYMERES, II, 618 - 619, 621 - 623.

within sight of the city, fields, orchards, and vineyards were destroyed wholesale. Attempts to buy off the new Catalan leader, de Rocafort, failed because his demands were astronomically high⁸⁵. The horror of Asia Minor was being repeated at the walls of Constantinople. Muntaner proudly declared that for five years the Catalans lived off the crops which the Byzantines had planted, «for we never sowed or planted or dug over the land»⁸⁶. He added that the terror which the Catalans created among the Byzantine population at this time was so extreme that the very word «frank» was sufficient to send the people into flight⁸⁷. Pachymeres offered the same pathetic account of the inhabitants of the suburbs, countryside, and Pera who, along with the Anatolian refugees, crowded the fortress-capital, already plagued by famine.

The terrible suffering occasioned by the Catalan siege in the winter of 1306 - 1307 prompted the philanthropic Athanasios to ameliorative efforts. He ordered great processions of common folk and aristocrats to march through the city barefoot in repentance for the sins which had brought about this suffering and opened soup kitchens at key locations around the city to feed the hungry⁸⁸.

In spite of Andronicos' indecisive character, in the fall of 1306 he ordered all crops to be destroyed and all cultivation, heretofore accomplished under armed guard, to cease. By so doing he hoped to deprive the Catalans of their food supply and starve them out of Thrace. The formerly rich farm land between the lower reaches of the Mercia river and the walls of Constantinople was turned into a desert⁸⁹. Needless to say, this decision aggravated the already severe famine in the overcrowded capital.

Although this policy to drive off the Catalans was eventually successful, it was violently opposed by Athanasios, who cared more for the immediate relief of the suffering population of Constantinople than for a potential long-run victory. He wrote to Andronicos

85. PACHYMERES, I, 622 - 623. Several imperial embassies were sent to de Rocafort offering him and his troops money and citizenship if they would again resume Byzantine service. See DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 2302 (14 October 1306).

86. MUNTANER, *op. cit.*, CCXXV.

87. *Ibid.*, CCXXI - CCXXIII.

88. PACHYMERES, II, 528 - 529.

89. PACHYMERES, II: 628; also LAIOU, «The Provisioning of Constantinople During the Winter of 1206 - 07», *Byzantion*, XXXVII (1967), 100 - 101.

For leaving the land unplanted, holy emperor, will bring more destruction than profit, seeing that it is our sins which force the goodness of God to deliver us over to various misfortunes or even to the sword. And instead of demonstrating substantial conversion and marked repentance . . . we rather indulge in oppression of the poor, and kindle the injustice and greed of those who rage in such <oppression>⁹⁰

He plainly suggested that some merchants in the city encouraged this scorched-earth policy in order to enhance their own dishonest gain: «And would that you did not yield to those who yearn for this sort <of profit>, but punish them rather than forbidding the people «to till the soil in order to earn their living»⁹¹. As usual in Athanasios' letters, he returned to the primary cause of Byzantine suffering – sin and the failure to offer repentance. Andronicos' scorched-earth policy was, in fact, successful and was probably the primary reason the Catalans moved out of Thrace, through Macedonia, and into Greece proper in 1308⁹². For some seven years the Catalan Company had wreaked havoc with Byzantine affairs. Their presence was a witness to the hopelessness of the Byzantine military position in face of the Turkish onslaught.

In addition to the threats to the Orthodox faith and the plundering of Catalan mercenaries, Athanasios was embittered by the commercial supremacy of the Italian merchants which occasioned the exploitation of the Byzantine people, particularly the poor. In fact, the patriarch Athanasios was particularly important in the realm of social welfare and reform, reacting vigorously to the exploitative role of Latin merchants, who since the end of the eleventh century had dominated much of Byzantine grain traffic⁹³. For example, in one letter to Andronicos he violently attacked grain dealers and profiteers («those who are enriched by Mammon have not hesitated to hoard grain and wine which God has furnished for the support of the people . . . to the ruin of the poor»), even threatening to read the letter in church and excommunicate the deal-

90. V = 46r (TALBOT, 67; *Regestes*, 1650).

91. V = 46v (TALBOT, 67; *Regestes*, 1650).

92. NICOL, *op. cit.*, 141.

93. DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS, «Life and Social Welfare Activity of Patriarch Athanasios I of Constantinople», *Theologia*, *XLI* (1975), 611 - 625.

ers⁹⁴. Pachymeres implied that the letter was, in fact, read publicly, but to no avail⁹⁵.

Sometime during the fall, 1306, most likely during the Catalan siege of Constantinople, Athanasios addressed a letter of condemnation to Andronicos on the occasion of the severe famine. It seems that the Black Sea ports for Thracian grain, such as Mesembria, had been closed by the Bulgarian Svjetoslav and grain shipments blockaded. Although grain and other victuals were stored in the city, their distribution was inequitable and the poor could get food only at very high prices. The fact that the Genoese and Venetian merchants held their food supplies stocked in Pera and Constantinople forced prices to rise as did the debasement of the coinage⁹⁶. In fact, the food shortage was artificial and wheat continued to be exported to the West. Athanasios reported that on walks through the city, the poor and the hungry «complain as if with one voice about the grain, and almost everyone entreats me piteously that it not leave the capital . . . »⁹⁷ He promised the people that he would urge the emperor to forbid the export of grain to Italy by Genoese merchants.

To ensure a fair distribution of grain, Athanasios suggested to Andronicos that he establish a grain commission to oversee the storage and distribution of all food stuffs in the city,

«for it will contribute much to the incomparable blessing of good order. For the state is suffering great harm from the famine, since the Romans' [Byzantines'] fortune, both gold and silver, has almost all ended up in the hands of the Latins. But worst is their arrogance as they laugh at us haughtily, and despise us so much that they boast of receiving favors from the wives of citizens in payment for grain . . . For this reason I ask that your majesty see to it that they not gloat any more in such undertakings. . . . »⁹⁸

The Latins here referred to are no doubt the Genoese of Pera whose ships monopolized the Black Sea grain traffic⁹⁹.

94. V = 81r (TALBOT, 106; *Regestes*, 1606); cf. also G.I. BRATIANU, «La question de l'approvisionnement de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine et ottomane», *Byzantion*, V (1929 - 1930): 101.

95. PACHYMERES, II, 461.

96. PACHYMERES, II, 493 - 494.

97. V = 54r (TALBOT, 72; *Regestes*, 1649).

98. V = 75r (TALBOT, 93; *Regestes*, 1652).

99. PACHYMERES, II, 597, 605.

Byzantine wealth, according to Athanasios, was literally pouring into the hands of the Latin merchants due to their control of shipping and marketing of necessary food stuffs during a time of famine and inflation. In addition, Athanasios' persistent concern that good order should reign in the Church and the empire is evident in his letters. This passion for the proper functioning of the Orthodox commonwealth informs both the patriarch's enforcement of traditional Byzantine canonical requirements within the church and his effort to reestablish statist controls over the Byzantine economy. For example, Athanasios' call for a grain commission to control sales, weights, and measures was an attempt to return the empire to its previous statist policy as outlined in the tenth century *Book of the Prefect*, where weights, measures, and prices were all under the strict scrutiny of the prefect for the well-being of the capital and its population¹⁰⁰. In fact, a good argument can be made that Athanasios, as patriarch, saw himself in the role of the old Prefect of the City. To further the control of food stuffs by the state, Athanasios also recommended that Andronicos return to the policy of his father Michael VIII regarding the resale of wheat shipped through Constantinople. Much of Genoese profit rested in the shipments of Black Sea grain to Italy. He urged Andronicos to forbid the export of wheat to Italy if the price at Constantinople were over 50 hyperpers for 100 modioi of wheat¹⁰¹. There had been a relaxation in the enforcement of the old regulation and Athanasios asked rather bluntly that Andronicos «not yield to bribes, either through the disease of greed or simply friendship. . . .»¹⁰² It is evident that Athanasios blamed Andronicos for the condition of the people and for the fact that Latin merchants had the upper hand in the Byzantine market, destroying both economy and people. Such a situation was intolerable to an ecclesiastic who held such an all-pervasive view of the powers and responsibilities of the patriarchal office.

100. Cf. *Book of the Prefect* in ZEPOS AND ZEPOS, II, 388; LAIOU, *Constantinople*, 196.

101. LAIOU, «Provisioning», pp. 92 - 94. G.I. BRATIANU, *Études byzantines d'histoire économique et sociale* (Paris, 1938), 161 - 162; in 1302 Andronicos concluded a treaty with the Venetians by which they were permitted to export wheat as long as the price was not greater than 100 hyperper/100 modioi in Constantinople.

102. V = 53r (TALBOT, 72; *Regestes*, 1649).

Jews, Armenians, and Muslims

Athanasios was as violently opposed to the Jews' presence in Constantinople as he was to the Latin Christians — an opposition which may be interpreted in several ways. First, it might be considered as a traditional theological «hostility» toward the Jews common throughout Byzantine history, but rarely showing its face in violent terms; second, as an opposition to another non-Orthodox religious group, representing «disorder» in what was otherwise supposed to be a theological homogeneous society; or, finally, the Byzantine empire as an analogue of the Old Israel and hence the Jews within the heart of the empire represented an unpleasant theological anachronism. Nevertheless, in no place in his correspondence did Athanasios call for anything resembling a pogrom or coercive measures against the Jewish community in Constantinople¹⁰³.

From the late-tenth century to the early-eleventh century there was a noticeable migration of Jews into the empire from areas then under Muslim domination¹⁰⁴. After the mid-eleventh century Jews began to settle unofficially and voluntarily in the Pikridion quarter of Pera - Galata, across the Golden Horn from Constantinople. Alexios I confirmed this move to Pera as part of a general allocation of quarters to different national and religious groups¹⁰⁵. The Constantinopolitan Jewish community was hence moved from the capital to the suburban location, while yet maintaining a commercial landing in the city¹⁰⁶. Benjamin of Tudela, the best witness to this Jewish community, visited Constantinople around 1168 and estimated the Jewish population of Pera at about 2000 Rabbanite and 500 Karaite Jews, probably referring to heads of families¹⁰⁷. During his visit they were largely employed as silk-

103. G. GALANTÉ, *Les Juifs de Constantinople sous Byzance* (Istanbul: Imprimerie Babok, 1940), 23 - 25; and DAVID JACOBY, «Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine», *Byzantion*, XXVII (1967), 167 - 168.

104. ANDREW SHARF, *Byzantine Jewry from Justinian to the Fourth Crusade* (London: ROUTLEDGE and KEGAN PAUL, 1971), 107.

105. ANNA COMNENA, *The Alexiade*, II, translated by B. LEIB (Paris: GUILAUME BUDE, 1967), 54.

106. SHARF, *op. cit.*, 16 - 17, 153 - 154; JACOBY, *op. cit.*, 169 - 175. This move was officially confirmed by Alexios Comnenos in allocating residential and commercial quarters for different groups.

107. BENJAMIN OF TUDELA, *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, 2 vols, translated by A. ASHER (London 1907), 54 - 56. SHARF, *op. cit.*, 3, notes that

workers and tanners, and formed, by virtue of their common employment, corporations or guilds¹⁰⁸. Whether these were free associations or enforced on them in virtue of their common religion is not clear. Throughout the Byzantine period most Jews seem to have mingled freely in Byzantine commercial and economic life. They seemed to face at the very worst what one author describes as an official policy of toleration and a popular attitude of hostility: «If the Jews were not isolated, they were not loved»¹⁰⁹. Another author concludes that «in a word the Byzantine Jews were declassified»¹¹⁰. Certainly, one reason for such large numbers migrating into

these figures represent heads of families. He estimates the actual Jewish population of the capital at about 10,000 in the late twelfth century. It is interesting to note here the existence of the Karaite sect of Jews within the Rabbanite Jewish community; the Karaite sect was itself set off by the Rabbanite Jews in a ghetto within a ghetto. Sharf quotes the pertinent passage of Benjamin, see *ibid.*, 134 - 136. On the Karaites, see ZVI ANKORI, *Karaites in Byzantium: The Formative Years, 970 - 1100* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959). Karaitism never spread in western Europe, but founded a number of prosperous and intellectually creative centers within Greek Orthodox Christendom. The reasons for this have never been investigated. On the origins of Byzantine Karaitism, see *ibid.*, 58 - 85.

108. SHARF, *op. cit.*, 17, and JACOBY, *op. cit.*, 181, 190. Jacoby explains the existence of a «Jewish» quarter on the basis of the common profession to which Jews belonged. This author would, given the effective collapse of the Byzantine guild system at this period and the Byzantine custom of granting segregated quarters to «foreign» groups, incline toward the belief that the common quarter was in fact a ghetto. Benjamin explains at least part of the Byzantine hostility toward the twelfth century Jewish community on the basis of the fact that they were largely employed as tanners «who poured out their dirty water outside the doors of their houses». See BENJAMIN OF TUDELA, *op. cit.*, 56.

109. SHARF, *op. cit.*, 17. Canon 11 of the Council in Trullo (691 - 692), RHALLES AND POTLES, II, 328, condemned Jewish customs among Christians as well as familiar contacts between the two groups. According to the *Epanagoge*, Title IX, 13, pagans, Jews, and heretics were forbidden to serve in the army and were completely disenfranchised; see ERNEST BARLER, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), 94.

110. JOSHUA STARR, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 641 - 1204* (Athens: Byzantinische - Neugriechische, 1939), 25. For an excellent introduction to the Byzantine Jewish community in the Byzantine empire, see DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS, «Greek Orthodox - Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective», *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, XXII (1977), 6 - 16. For a more sociological approach to the same material, see ZVI ANKORI, «Greek Orthodox - Jewish Relations in Historic Perspective - the Jewish View», *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, XXII (1977), 17 - 57.

Byzantium was the relatively peaceful conditions for Jews under imperial authority.

At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the Byzantine Jewish population was widely distributed and, prior to the Fourth Crusade, had enjoyed some two hundred years of political and economic stability. The Latin occupation of Constantinople upset this situation, causing the various Jewish communities, no longer under a single regime, to have to deal with the separate and several Greek and Latin principalities. But once the Byzantines regained Constantinople, their lot improved. Not only did they, along with Armenians and certain groups of Latins, help to repopulate a largely deserted city, but they exercised their religious obligations unhampered.¹¹¹ By the time of Andronicos' reign the Jewish population in Constantinople seems to have been sizable. The Arab chronicler al-Gazari reported that in 1293 his father had met a Muslim merchant who had lived in Constantinople for twelve years and who had informed his father that both Jews and Muslims lived in the city and had their separate quarters¹¹². In spite of legal disabilities, the Jewish population enjoyed an active and influential commercial life, were tolerated, and were even legally granted a quarter in which to live. Charanis describes Andronicos' policy towards the Jews as one «of absolute toleration» which continued the practice of his father, Michael VIII¹¹³.

Maximos Planudes, a contemporary of Athanasios, in a letter dated shortly after 1298, mentioned the presence of Jewish tanners in the Vlanga region on the Propontis and not far from the Church of the Prodromos¹¹⁴. Al-Gazari mentioned a gate and a wall around

111. PETER CHARANIS, «The Jews in the Byzantine Empire Under the First Paleologi», *Speculum*, XXII (1947), 75 - 76; see also STARR, *Romania*, 27.

112. M. IZEDDIN, «Un texte arab sur Constantinople byzantine», *Journal asiatique*, CCXLVI (1958), 453 - 457; the Arab merchant being quoted by al-Gazari is Abdullah b. Mohammed who lived in Constantinople from 1281 to 1293.

113. CHARANIS, *op. cit.*, 76. The fact that the Jewish population in Constantinople existed almost entirely within the same guilds, makes it difficult to distinguish between a measure directed at Jews *qua* Jews and Jews *qua* members of a particular trade association. See on this JOSHUA STARR, *Romania*, 112 - 113.

114. On the location of the Jewish quarter, see MAXIMUS PLANUDES, *Maximi monachi Planudis epistolae*, edited by M. TREU (Breslau: A. M. HAKKERT, 1886

the Muslim quarter, but did not mention one around the Jewish quarter ¹¹⁵. Regardless of whether a wall existed, there was a designated and closely regulated quarter for Jewish inhabitants by imperial will; the quarter may well have been designated as a commercial quarter for Jewish guilds ¹¹⁶.

To the Jewish quarter, and to similar ones granted to Armenians and Muslims, Athanasios protested vigorously. His opposition, however, was within the context of his fundamental objection to the anomalous presence of any non-Orthodox religious faithful in the midst of the capital of the Orthodox Christian empire ¹¹⁷. He reproached Andronicos for allowing the Jews to establish themselves and their «deicide synagogue» in the midst of the Orthodox faithful and to allow them to mock Christian practices (μυκτηρίζοντας τὰ ἡμέτερα) among them the veneration of icons ¹¹⁸. The introduction (τῆ εἰσαγωγῆ) of Jews and Armenians into the city (no doubt as part of Michael VIII's policy) defiled the common people's faith and complicated their plight in the absence of episcopal instruction ¹¹⁹. As in other references to non-Orthodox, Athanasios attacked their presence in the context of injustices; on this occas-

- 1890), epistola 31, p. 52; Planudes' letter places the Jewish quarter on the Propontis in the Vlanga regions: ὅτι καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀλλαγῶ καθιδρυμένους τὰ πρότερα μετὰ ταῦτα φέροντες οἱ τηρικαῦτα τὰ κατὰ τὸν Βλάγκαν ἐπιτετραμμένοι αὐτοῦ που κτώλοισαν περὶ τὸν νεῶν . . .

115. Although the existence of a wall around some or all of these quarters does not have to be assumed, it may be; it was common Byzantine practice to set off non-Orthodox in ghettos; see the «Responsa» of John, Bishop of Kition, to Constantine Cabasilas, Archbishop of Duzazzo (RHALLÉS AND POTLES, V, 415). In the late twelfth century, Constantine had written to John asking whether it was permissible for Armenians to build churches within Byzantine cities. John responded that «quarters located either within or outside are set apart for each of these groups [Jews, Armenians, Ismaelites, Hagarites] that they may be restricted to these quarters and not extend their residence beyond them».

116. GALANTÉ, *op. cit.*, 23ff. The Jews living outside of the Jewish quarter may well have been western Jews; in Pera, for instance, the Jewish community was most probably of Genoese origin.

117. V = 12Γ (TALBOT, 23; *Regestes*, 1621). He describes their removal as ἔργα θεοφιλή.

118. V = 18Γ (TALBOT, 41; *Regestes*, 1622): ὅτι τὴν θεοκτόνον συναγωγὴν μὴ μόνον μέσον καθίζεσθαι παραχωροῦμεν τῶν Ὀρθοδόξων.

119. V = 16V (TALBOT, 36; *Regestes*, 1639).

ion, it was episcopal malfeasance. In another letter he offered a strange mixture of charity and intolerance, moving from the care of Anatolian refugees in Constantinople, to the canonical prohibition against eating with heretics (μη ἐπιγαμβρεύειν), to the necessity «to hate the Jews» if they do not receive baptism. He added that Jewish doctors must not be sought out for healing ¹²⁰.

Athanasios' objections were based not only on principle but also on specific instances of what he termed inappropriate behavior. He complained, for instance, about their inordinate influence over public officials and specifically denounced Kokales, presumably an official, who was bribed (διὰ δώρων) by Jews wishing to gain some unspecified advantage ¹²¹. Athanasios charged further that if any Orthodox complained the plaintiff was jailed! Starr notes that Athanasios' complaint seems to have been unique in the medieval Byzantine period and «one doubts that any such danger existed» ¹²². Laurent, however, suggests that the objection is not at all improbable, but it reflects the presence of a community, perhaps of both Byzantine and western Jews, which exercised «une indiscutable force économique», which brought much profit to the state and high officials, and consequently bought protection from anti-Jewish complaints such as those leveled by Athanasios ¹²³. Planudes, however, did make the cryptic complaint that Jews do take «the first seats» ¹²⁴. Athanasios added a further complaint that Jews «are against my entering the Church of God and proclaiming

120. V = 226r (*Regestes*, 1777): Ἰουδαίους τοὺς Θεοκτόνους μισεῖν; strictly speaking Athanasios' attitudes toward Jews does not represent an anti-Semitism as such, but an anti-Judaism. A Jewish convert, according to this text, presumably became a Semitic Christian, enjoying the full citizenship of the empire. In another location, the pettiness of Athanasios' dislike of the Jews becomes more evident; he writes that the suffering of Christian refugees «would bring tears even to a Jew» (ὤνπερ τὴν συμφορὰν καὶ Ἰουδαῖος ἐθρήνησεν ἄν); see V = 31r (TALBOT, 46; *Regestes*, 1693). Canon II of the Council in Trullo forbid this consulting of Jewish physicians (RHALLÉS AND POTLES, II, 328 - 329).

121. V = 18v (TALBOT, 41; *Regestes*, 1622).

122. STARR, *The Jews*, 27.

123. LAURENT, *Regestes*, 417. On the economic activities of Jews, both Byzantine and Italian, within the empire, see JACOBV, *op. cit.*, 189 - 205 and STARR *Romania*. 25 - 35.

124. PLANUDES, *op. cit.*, epistola 31, p. 51.

the holy suffering of my Lord as is customary»¹²⁵. The patriarch was no doubt referring to the Jews' possible disruption of Good Friday services, a possibility which seems unlikely without a significantly aggressive and influential Jewish community in the capital to protect such activity. Talbot's suggestion that the patriarch is here drawing a parallel between the Jews and those bishops who opposed his retaking of the throne and consequently his celebrating the liturgy seems improbable¹²⁶. All Athanasios' complaints apparently had no short or long term effects on Andronicos who in 1319 issued a chrysobull which included the affirmation that the Jews of Joannina in Epiros were to freely enjoy the same privileges as other residents¹²⁷.

Athanasios was also hostile toward Armenian Christians, both the Chalcedonian, those in communion with Rome, and the non-Chalcedonian, those separated from communion with both Latin and Greek Churches since the Council of Chalcedon (451). Although the Byzantines distrusted the Armenians, they were never prevented from playing a leading role in the administrative and civil affairs. Nevertheless, any Armenian attaining to any position was required to assume the Orthodox faith. Especially during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the Armenian Church was seen as the object of conversion attempts either conciliar or coercive, or a mixture of the two. All union efforts and negotiation failed and served only to heighten the Armenian hatred for Byzantines and their Church¹²⁸. At the end of the eleventh century, the Church of Cilician Armenia undertook a series of union negotiations with the Church of Rome. During the period of these various negotiations, the Church began to assume many western liturgical characteristics, texts, and vestments. Finally, in 1198 union was effected between the Churches of Rome and Cilicia - Armenia. The Armenian Church and kingdom of Cilicia were both integrated into Western Christendom until 1375 when the kingdom was extinguished and the union dissolved by the Turks¹²⁹.

125. V = 80v (TALBOT, 105; *Regestes*, 1731).

126. TALBOT, Commentary on Letter 105.

127. MIKLOSICH and MÜLLER, *op. cit.*, V, 83.

128. SPEROS VRYONIS, «Byzantium: The Social Basis of Decline in the Eleventh Century», *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, II (1959), 169 - 173.

129. CHARLES A. FRAZER, «The Christian Church in Cilician Armenia: Its

In addition to Athanasios' general objections to Armenians, sometime between 1303 and 1305 he wrote the wife of Michael IX and cryptically discussed the purity of the Orthodox faith. Rita/Maria, an Armenian, had, on marrying Michael, become Orthodox. Athanasios praised her efforts to establish religious peace with the «schismatics», but did not elaborate on just who these schismatics were ¹³⁰. Since there were no large scale union negotiations going on, we can assume that Athanasios was praising her efforts to convert the retainers and relatives who had accompanied her to the Byzantine capital.

More generally, he raised objections, as he did in the case of the Jews, that so small a kingdom could exercise so great an influence over affairs in Constantinople. «As for the outrages which the Armenians perpetrate toward the neighboring Orthodox Christians, I am ashamed to tell the story, God being witness». The patriarch was, however, able to conjure up only one feeble specific: «They are not prevented from having a meeting house for their prayers. . . .»¹³¹ He specifically mentioned that if an Orthodox complained of the existence of this Armenian church in the city, the Armenians, like the Jews, raised a great objection and with a «few coins» have the complaint put aside ¹³².

Finally, Athanasios directed his hostile attention toward the presence of Muslims, who also came to the city mainly for commercial reasons and settled in their own quarter; but unlike the Jews and Armenians, their co-religionists, the Turkish Muslims, were then destroying the Byzantine provinces and the Orthodox Church in Anatolia.

Even though the Muslim population of the city increased considerably after 1262 when Muslim refugees sought haven from the Mongols, Byzantines never matched the intolerant fanaticism of Is-

Relations with Rome and Constantinople to 1198», *Church History*, XLV (1976), 166 - 184, especially 182 - 184.

130. V = 15r - 15v (TALBOT, 34; *Regestes*, 1689). Talbot reasonably suggests that this letter is actually referring to the Arsenites and not the Armenians. See TALBOT, Commentary on Letter 34.

131. V = 18r (TALBOT, 41; *Regestes*, 1622).

132. V = 18r (TALBOT, 41; *Regestes*, 1622): δι' ὀλίγων βασιλικῶν. The Basilikon was a new monetary species minted under Andronicos II in 1304 and being 1/45 of the value of the traditional hyperpyron. Andronicos had created the coin to pay the Catalan mercenaries; see V. LAURENT, «Le basilicon», 50-58.

lam or the Latin west, and the imperial authority maintained its traditional tolerant attitude toward sectarians¹³³. Athanasios' hostility remained the exception in this period, tying his objections to their presence to the condition of Christians in Anatolia. The Ismaelites, his romantic and biblical appellation for the Turks, ruled Christian cities and, he complained, did not even allow the faithful to sound the *semandron* (σήμαντρον). How then can Andronicos permit a mosque in the city from which the muezzins «shout forth their abominable mysteries»¹³⁴. Allowing Andronicos the benefit of the doubt, the patriarch faulted the witnesses of those offenses for hiding them from the emperor's knowledge. The mosque to which he referred is no doubt the one which had been constructed by Michael VIII and to which the Arab chronicler al-Gazari made reference in describing the Muslim quarter in Constantinople¹³⁵.

In the best tradition of Byzantine monasticism, Athanasios was a man of action. His vision of his patriarchal responsibilities forced him into every aspect of Byzantine life — social, political, and ecclesiastical. For this all-pervasive interference, he was disliked by large numbers of the highly placed in both church and civil bureaucracy.

Athanasios represents, in the larger perspective of Byzantine history, the movement of power and influence into the hands of the Byzantine Church as the political integrity of the empire disintegrated. Accompanying this political decline was the growth of anti-Latin sentiment, which sought to protect both the purity of the Orthodox faith and the integrity of the Byzantine political structure. In Athanasios' view, Orthodoxy and nationalism were synonymous. Athanasios' reaction to Latin Christians, and indeed to

133. LAURENT, «L'idée», 85 - 86; Laurent notes that the Orthodox may well have shunned contact with the Muslims, but made no effort to forcibly convert them. See DÖLGER, *Regesten*, 2145, where Andronicus issues a *pro-stagma* dated sometime between 1292 and 1294 in which the Seljuk sultan is granted refuge in Constantinople and his safety guaranteed; see PACHYMERES, II, 612 - 613.

134. V = 18v (TALBOT, 41; *Regestes*, 1622): τὰ μυσὰ ἀπὸν ἐκφωνοῦσι μυστήρια. The *σημαντήρ*, a wooden board, was struck to announce liturgical services.

135. On the mosque dating from the reign of Michael VIII, see the History of Makrisi in *Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks de l'Egypte*, translated by M. QUATREMERRE, I (Paris, 1837), 177; also TALBOT, Commentary on Letter 41.

all non-Orthodox religious elements, was not based on monastic obscurantism but on the understanding of the Orthodox empire as a monistic polity whose welfare was guaranteed by a covenant with God. This covenant was based on the purity of the Orthodox faith, social justice, and morality. As is evident from Athanasios' correspondence, this understanding was the basis of his reform efforts, including his passion to rid Constantinople of its non-Orthodox religious population.

Byzantium was an unusually tolerant multi-national state, where many different creeds and cultures were permitted to sojourn with relative security and minor legal disabilities. Athanasios, however, was not tolerant. He saw the presence of so many influential non-Orthodox as both a result of Byzantine weakness and the cause of that weakness. But he was also aware of the fact that the Byzantine malaise was not due exclusively to a foreign religious presence. They were merely part of a larger problem which had its roots among the Byzantines themselves, in their lack of faith, justice, and morality. The patriarch was well aware that the Byzantine merchants and people were at least as guilty of exploitation as the Latins.

In spite of the concentration of this study, Athanasios was not obsessed with xenophobia. The references to Latin Christians or non-Orthodox religions actually represent a minor portion of his letters. In addition, he nowhere calls for the use of physical violence against non-Orthodox individuals; he merely requested the removal of the quarters occupied by Jews, Armenians, Muslims, and Latins beyond the walls of the city. He never called for the total economic isolation of any of these communities. In the light of the possibilities open to medieval intolerance, Athanasios was quite restrained in his requests. His failure to achieve the little he asked, except in the case of the Latin monastery, marks his policy as essentially a rhetorical response to a desperate ecclesiastical and political situation.

Chapter IX

CONCLUSIONS

The sainted patriarch Athanasios was a man of his age, a Byzantine who operated fully within the context of Byzantine ecclesiastical and political traditions. His reforms, which were the subject of this work, must of necessity be judged by the criteria of the ecclesiastical and political milieu of which he was part and the objective principles which he established as his guides. The purpose of this study has been to investigate Athanasios' reform of ecclesiastical abuses and to place them both within the context of the ecclesiastical and social events of the turn of the fourteenth century and the traditions of Orthodox canon law, the Scriptures, and monastic life. This study has demonstrated that by his reforming efforts, Athanasios, for the period of his two patriarchates, played a significant role in the ecclesiastical and political life of the Byzantine empire.

We have observed that while domestic and international forces brought on the decline of the Byzantine empire and the imperial authority, Athanasios led the Constantinopolitan patriarchate toward a period of ecclesiastical ascendancy. In spite of similar elements of decay within the Church itself, the authority, influence, and prestige of the patriarchate of Constantinople was increasing in almost direct proportion to the decline of the empire. Under the direction of Athanasios the patriarchate extended its authority and influence not only outside of Byzantine territory itself, but also into secular affairs, especially judicial, and over all the monasteries in the Byzantine Empire. Precisely the opposite development of what might have been expected of a so-called state Church, whose traditional intimate association with the secular authority should have led to its accompanying decline with the state. Athanasios pushed the power and competence of the patriarchate and the Church into every aspect and corner of the enfeebled Byzantine empire and in the process infringed upon secular affairs, *mutatis mutandis*, paralleling the role traditionally played by the emperor in ecclesiastical life.

Athanasios sought, as did the monastic hesychast movement which came to its height in the mid-fourteenth century, to purify and to enliven the vital forces of the Orthodox Church. This effort to return the Church to canonical normalcy was designed to prepare it for what Athanasios conceived to be its true mission, regardless of the political and military exigencies of the besieged Byzantine empire. Although specific reform measures were short-lived, or failed altogether, Athanasios was fundamentally successful and his popularity among the people and the hesychasts attested to his continuing influence throughout the fourteenth century. His influence transcended the immediate issues facing the empire and is properly understood only in the context of a larger reform movement and the general growth of ecclesiastical authority.

Athanasios must be recognized as one of the outstanding patriarchs of the Constantinopolitan Church. He demonstrated a vision of his importance and the importance of his office which bordered on the Gregorian in its affirmation of independence from and superiority over the secular authority. To this effect, Laiou has concluded with the advantage of hindsight that Athanasios «must be placed in the long line of late-Byzantine patriarchs who were strong-minded, strong-willed, [and] interested in the welfare of the people . . . »¹ On the basis of this study Laiou's judgment must necessarily be extrapolated back in time and broadened in content; Athanasios was in fact one of the most significant personalities and leading ethical thinkers of the Orthodox Church.

It is to Athanasios' credit that, inspite of his universally recognized inflexibility, he demonstrated both an immediate political acumen, as in the affair of the «olive branch», and the need to get to the radical roots of the Byzantine dilemma—economic exploitation, injustice, and corruption. In his ecclesiastical reforms, Athanasios' efforts were based on traditional Byzantine Christian canonical and moral norms. In the substance of his reforms, therefore, he was a conservative, seeking to restore the Church to what, in his mind, it had been.

All of Athanasios' reforming measures had as their goal the restoration of the Byzantine body politic. His letters represent a fundamentally prophetic moral stance - God's chastisement, the

1. LAIOU, *Constantinople*, 199.

loss of the empire itself by the Orthodox, was the inevitable result of the violation of moral and canonical laws. In Athanasios' logic, the restoration of the empire had to begin with the Church since Orthodoxy was the substratum upon which the social order was built; Byzantium, for Athanasios, indeed for Byzantines in general, was the New Israel, the people of God. The Church—bishops, clerics, monks—was to provide the pattern for authentic renewal on the basis of canonical and scriptural tradition and monastic mutuality. Without this essentially ecclesiological perspective on the patriarch's work, his correspondence with churchmen remains a compilation of tiresome pious exhortations presented in a noisomely unsystematic fashion. The letters which Athanasios addressed to the emperor, and which have received some attention from modern historians, are but reflections of the patterns he established as logical priorities in his ecclesiastical correspondence.

Although Athanasios' reform of ecclesiastical abuses is the main consideration of this study, it would be impossible to separate them from his general concern for the reconstruction of Byzantine social life. Athanasios' vision of his office was essentially moral and spiritual in content; yet, however incomprehensible for the modern mind, his vision encompassed more than the spiritual realm. Throughout his letters his primary emphasis was on personal repentance as the basis for the salvation of the empire, yet the call did not stop at the establishment of an emotional or psychological state; his call for repentance was followed through, with invariable prophetic logic, with a call to action addressed to every class of Byzantine society from the emperor to the simplest monk. It is naive to believe that Athanasios' conceptions would have allowed him to limit himself to mere pious exhortations. His program went beyond the demand for frequent prayers, processions, and intercessions to save the empire and included a genuine social reorientation. His was a call to rebuild the entire Byzantine social order on the basis of the monastic ideals of the cenobium.

The main themes by which this study has proceeded—Athanasios' prophetic self-identification, sense of ritual and moral purity, canonical rigorism, and the freedom and order of the Church—would provide the foundation for a fascinating study of the patriarch's social reforms, which were significant enough to belie the oft repeated charge that Byzantine religious thinking, and more especially monastic, was devoid of any ethical or social empha-

sis. It is clear that none of the patriarch's activities in areas other than those specifically ecclesiastical would in any way contradict the categories of investigation or the conclusions established in this study. Rather, such an investigation of his social and economic measures would, I believe, reinforce the interpretations developed in the ecclesiastical sphere and actually cast him in a more radical role than that indicated by his ecclesiastical efforts.

Essentially a conservative, Athanasios founded his ecclesiastical reforms solidly in traditional Byzantine Christian canonical norms. The content of his reforms is not in itself anything exceptional. Only in the extent of his reforming zeal, only in the fact that questions of «good order» and ecclesiastical discipline occupied almost all of his attention, and only in his attempt to press patriarchal jurisdiction into every corner of the empire and into every aspect of the Church's life, may he be considered revolutionary. The contents of his measures are not in themselves anything exceptional.

In studying Athanasios' reforms, we have taken into account not only the canonical and moral norms by which he was guided, but also the immediate and practical need for reform as he saw it—as a means of assuring the good-will of God, the stability of the empire, and the loyalty of a disaffected populace. Athanasios was not merely a canonical rigorist. Had he been concerned only with the application of the canons, he would have been content with extensive quotes—and a less significant figure in Orthodox Church history. Actually, with the exception of his Arsenite dossier, Athanasios rarely quoted the canons, but simply referred to something being canonical or not. He largely based his arguments on the historical conditions within the empire and the need for personal discipline at a time of great human misery. This emphasis was perhaps most clear in his demands for episcopal residence and monastic *stabilitas loci*. Although others have considered these two demands, the object of this study has been to elucidate them from both the historical and ecclesiological perspective. To this end, the question of episcopal residence has been divided into three basic categories in which Athanasios deals with the abuses of the refugee bishops: (1) the threat to the purity of the faith and the danger of conversion of the faithful due to the absence of the bishops from their proper dioceses and the presence of hostile religious forces, both Latin and Turkish; (2) the presence of ram-

pant and scandalous immorality among the bishops and their economic exploitation of the people; and, finally, (3) the violation of the ecclesiastical integrity of the Church of Constantinople by the presence of displaced provincial bishops and foreign patriarchs in the capital.

The two overriding goals of Athanasios' reforms—freedom of the Church and «good order» in the Christian community—aroused the opposition of numerous influential officials, bishops, clerics, and monks who found his rigorous demands intolerable and who finally brought about his two resignations. In spite of this evident hostility, Athanasios apparently remained a popular figure among many monks and the majority of the people. The existence of his two *vitae* and the references to his letters as existing in collected forms for the sake of inspirational reading confirm his popularity throughout the fourteenth century. Athanasios soon came to be regarded as a saint and his relics came to be renowned for their healing efficacy. The unedited fourteenth century «Oration on the Translation of Athanasios' Relics» offers, for instance, an account of some thirty-two people who were healed or in some way assisted through the veneration of these relics². They continued to have a fascinating history after the fall of Constantinople; apparently mistaking them for those of the fourth century St. Athanasios the Great of Alexandria, the Venetian merchant Domenico Zottarello, in an act of pious thievery, took them from the monastery at Xerolophos and delivered them to Venice where they were housed and venerated in various churches³. His commemoration continues until the present in the calendar of the Orthodox Church and is celebrated on October 28⁴.

2. Referred to in TALBOT, Correspondence XXVII: «Λόγος εἰς τὴν ἀνακομιδὴν τοῦ λευψάνου τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀθανασίου πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως», from Cod. Const. Chalk. mon. 64, fols. 157r - 199r.

3. D. STIERNON, «Le quartier du Xérolophos à Constantinople et les reliques Vénétiennes du Saint Athanase», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XIX (1961), 165 - 188; the relics were placed first in the church of St. Mark and then moved to that of Santa Croce. Stiernon points out that the Venetians are yet convinced that they are the relics of the Alexandrian patriarch. The history of the relics entered another phase when on the sixteenth centenary of St. Athanasios of Alexandria the relics were transferred to Alexandria and presented to Pope Shenouda III of the Coptic Orthodox Church as a gesture of ecumenical good will! See *Al Montada*, VII (May-June, 1973), 5.

4. K. ΔΟΥΚΑΚΗΣ, *Μέγας συναξαριστής πάντων τῶν ἁγίων τῶν καθ' ἅπαντα*

The genuine tragedy of Athanasios' two tenures on the patriarchal throne and the reforming zeal which characterized them was the failure of his specific reforms to survive. Fifty years later Gregoras would write:

if [Athanasios] had lasted longer as patriarch, the ways of the monastic life would have been improved and permanently established. But as soon as he was out of the way all types of diabolical diseases broke out in the holy monasteries⁵.

Although Gregoras is referring to Athanasios' monastic reforms, he interprets their failure in terms of Athanasios' too short tenure in office. The reasons for the almost immediate failure of Athanasios' measures are both more complicated and more difficult to clearly establish. They can, however, be reduced to several categories.

First, as all of the sources testify, Athanasios assumed the governance of the Church at a time of ecclesiastical anarchy. The Church and its discipline had been thrown into a state of turmoil due to the deposition of Arsenios and the Union of Lyons; both of these affairs created warring factions which undermined normal ecclesiastical authority and discipline. In addition, as the patriarch himself reported in his letters on monastic discipline, the Turkish invasions had led many monks to use their physical insecurity as the excuse for leaving their monasteries and seeking refuge in the cities of the empire. The bishops proffered the same excuse for leaving their dioceses and coming to Constantinople.

Second, as both Pachymeres and Gregoras attested, Athanasios' severely ascetical nature aroused the opposition of many churchmen and monks who did not share his commitment to canonical and ascetical discipline. In this context, Athanasios' personality itself, rather than his reforms, became the actual issue and the reason for much of the vocal opposition to his efforts. It is true that Athanasios' monastic training did not well suit him to governing secular men; in fact, it might be more generally concluded that saintly people are often not the best qualified to effect institutional changes, precisely what Athanasios was attempting to do. The

τόν μῆνα Ὀκτώβριον ἐορταζομένων. (Athens, 1855), 455. Some sources indicate that Athanasios' feast day is October 24.

5. GREGORAS, I, 184.

tragedy of Athanasios' thinking was the juxtaposition of a clear vision of what was true and pure, the inflexibility which this vision produced, and the inability of the social and ecclesiastical structures to conform to this norm. In many cases, Athanasios might have legitimately applied ecclesiastical dispensation, which would have permitted him to maintain a firmness in principle and a flexibility in practice. Such a policy might have permitted him to survive longer on the ecumenical throne and his reforms to take firmer root. Athanasios might indeed be faulted on the execution of his reforms, but not on their conception.

Third, contradicting the view presented by Pachymeres that Andronicos did everything requested by the patriarch, Athanasios' letters made clear that he was often left to his own resources. Andronicos simply did not have the strength or commitment to provide the necessary coercive support to enable Athanasios' reforms to take firm hold. Following the prophetic analogy, Athanasios was a type of Jeremiah, but, unhappily for his reform efforts, Andronicos was not of the stature of Josiah. Athanasios' stubbornness and rigidity might be blamed for prolonging ecclesiastical conflicts which kept Andronicos from giving his full attention to affairs of a military or political nature; a speedy settlement of the Arsenite schism, for example, could have freed Andronicos for other matters. But Andronicos' proverbial inadequacy as a ruler cannot so easily be blamed on Athanasios. The emperor's indecisiveness and weak nature are evidenced in the fact that even after the Arsenite settlement of 1310, Andronicos demonstrated no great ability to deal effectively with the innumerable threats facing the empire; he left his successors almost insuperable tasks. We may conclude from Athanasios' letters that Andronicos was not the man to effect decisive changes in Byzantine society.

Finally, a factor which is often ignored for the failure of Athanasios' reforms is the failure of his immediate successors, who were not men of particularly strong character, to maintain the changes he had brought about. Gregoras confirmed this interpretation when he wrote that

it would have been worthwhile if such a rule and a model [as that of Athanasios] had been maintained by his successors to the throne as during his patriarchate⁶.

6. GREGORAS I, 182.

While this factor may have been one of the reasons for the immediate failure of the patriarch's specific reforms, the power and authority of the patriarchate continued to grow. With the election of hesychast patriarchs such as Philotheos and Callistos in the mid-fourteenth century, this sense of patriarchal strength and importance received added impetus.

These four factors came together to weaken and destroy the effectiveness of Athanasios' reforming zeal, but not the influence which his personality had exerted on the people or on the development of patriarchal authority or prestige. The question of whether or not Athanasios was successful as ecumenical patriarch can be approached from either a political or ecclesiastical perspective. If we apply the former perspective, then we have to conclude that Athanasios was not successful in the politically sensitive position of ecumenical patriarch. He simply refused to make the necessary concessions to human frailty which the office demanded for the smooth functioning of the Byzantine *symphonia*. This study has not, however, limited itself to this perspective, which does an injustice to Athanasios and the moral and ecclesiastical issues he dealt with. The object of this study has been rather to demonstrate the nature of Athanasios' ecclesiastical reforms, the role he played in the growth of the ecumenical patriarchate, and the viability of Byzantine Christian ethical and reform thinking in the late-Byzantine period.

Athanasios' specific reforms may indeed have failed, but he was nonetheless successful as a forerunner, a teacher, and an actuator of a larger movement of ecclesiastical and social renewal. This ecclesiastical reawakening, highlighted by the hesychast conciliar victories of the mid-fourteenth century, allowed the Church, independently of the decaying political and military situation, to survive as a viable religious and ethnic institution during the prolonged Turkish and Islamic occupation which followed the collapse of Constantinople in 1453.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

- ADAM, GUILLAUME. «De modo Sarracenos extirpandi», edited by C. KOEHLER in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Documents arméniens*, II, Paris: Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, 1906, 523 - 548.
- AL-UMARI, SHIRAD AD-DIN. *Mesalek Alabsar fi memalek alamsar (Voyages des yeux dans les royaumes des différentes contrées)*. Translated into French by M. QUATREMERIE in *Notices et Extraite des Manuscrits*, XIII. Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1838, 151 - 384.
- ANDRONICOS II. «Γράμμα ὑποσχετικόν», edited in V. LAURENT, «Le serment de l'empereur Andronic II Paléologue au patriarche Athanase 1er, lors de sa seconde accession au trône oecuménique», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XXIII (1965), 138 - 139.
- «Λόγος χρυσόβουλλος, ἐπὶ τῇ ἐνώσει . . . » in J.F. BOISSONADE, (ed.) *Anecdota Graeca*, II. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962, 70 - 76.
 - Novel 39, in J.F. BOISSONADE, (ed.) *Anecdota Graeca*, II. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962, 107 - 137.
- ATHANASIOS I, Patriarch of Constantinople. Correspondence, in *Codex Vaticanus Graecus*, 2219, fols. 1r - 274r.
- Correspondence, in FRANCISCO TORRES. *De Residentia Pastorum jure divino scripto*. Florence, 1551, 70 - 90.
 - . Correspondence, in J.P. MIGNE, *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca*, CXLII (1885), cols. 513 - 528.
 - .. . Correspondence with Andronicos, in ALICE MARY TALBOT, (ed.), *The Correspondence of Athanasius, Patriarch of Constantinople*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Press, 1975.
 - . Neara, in G. RHALLES, and M. POTLES. *Σύνταγμα τῶν Θεῶν καὶ Ἱερῶν Κανόνων*, in 6 vols. Athens, 1855, 121 - 126.
 - . Neara, in J. and P. ZEPOS, *Jus Graecoromanum*, I (ex editione K.E. ZACHARIAE VON LINGENTHAL) Athens: Scientia Aalen, 1962, 533 - 536.
- BASIL OF CAESAREA. «Regulae fusius tractatae», in J.P. MIGNE, *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca*, XXXI. Paris, 1885, columns 905 - 1052.
- . «Ascetica II», in J.P. MIGNE, *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca*, XXXI (1885), 620 - 1428.
- BENJAMIN OF TUDELA. *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*. Translated by A. ASHER. London, 1907.
- BOMPAIRE, JACQUES (ed.). *Actes de Xéropotamou (Actes de l'Athos, 3)*. Paris: P. LETHIELLEUX, 1964.
- (CHOUMNOS, NICEPHOROS. «Ἐλεγγος κατὰ τοῦ κακῶς τὰ πάντα πατριαρχεύσαντος Νίφωνος», in J.F. BOISSONADE (ed.) *Anecdota Graeca*, V. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962, 255 - 288.

- COMNENA, ANNA. *The Alexiade*, II. Translated by B. LEIB. Paris: GUILLAUME BUDÉ, 1967.
- CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENETOS. *De administrando imperio*, edited by G. MORAVCSIK and R.J. JENKINS. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Press, 1967.
- DARROUZÈS, J. *Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine (Xe - XIIIe siècle)*. (Archives de l'Orient chrétien, 9). Paris: Institut français des Études byzantines, 1966.
- DEFRÉMERY, C. and B.R. SANGUINETTI, (eds.). *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, II. Paris: L'Imprimerie nationale 1914.
- GELZER, HEINRICH. «Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatum», *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften Abhandlungen der philosophisch - philologischen Klass.* Band 21 (1901), 595 - 606.
- GREGORAS, NICEPHOROS. *Byzantina Historia*, I. Edited by L. SCHOPEN. («Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae») Bonn, 1829.
- KALOTHEOTOS, JOSEPH. «Βίος και πολιτεία Ἀθανασίου Α', οἰκουµενικοῦ πατριάρχου» edited by ATHANASIOS PANTOKRATORINOS, in *Θρακικά*, XIII (1940), 56 - 107.
- KODINOS, GEORGE (PSEUDO). *Traité des Offices*. Edited and translated by JEAN VERPEAUX. Paris, 1966.
- «Λόγος εἰς τὴν ἀνακομιδὴν τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡµῶν Ἀθωνασίου . . .» quoted in ALICE-MARY TALBOT. «The Patriarch Athanasius and the Church», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XXVII (1973), 28.
- MANSI, JOANNES D. (ed.). *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, XI. Florence and Venice, 1758 - 1798.
- MIKLOSICH, FRANZ and J. MÜLLER (eds.). *Acta et Diplomata Graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, I, II. Vienna: C. GEROLD, 1860 - 1890.
- MUNTANER, RAMON. *The Chronicle of Muntaner*, 2 vols. Translated by LADY GOODENOUGH. (Works issued by the Hakluyt Society, 47, 50). London: Hakluyt Society, 1921.
- NOAILLES, P. and A. DAIN. *Les Nouvelles de Léon VI le Sage*. Paris: Société d'Édition des belles lettres, 1944.
- PACHYMERES, GEORGE. *De Andronico Palaeologo*, II. Edited by I. BEKKER. («Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae») Bonn, 1935.
- PALAMAS, GREGORY. *Triades pour la défense des saintes hésychastes*. Edited by JOHN MEYENDORFF. Louvain: Spicilegium sacrum Louvaniense, 1959.
- PAPADOPULOS - KERAMEUS, A. (ed.). «Zitija dvux Vselenskix patriarxov XIVv., svv. Afanasija I i Isidora Is. Zapiski istoriko-filo. fakul' teta Imperatorskogo S. - Peterburgskogo Universiteta, LXXVI (1905), 1 - 51.
- PETIT, L., and W. REGEL (eds.). *Actes d'Esphigménou*. (Actes de l'Athos, 3). Published in *Vizantiiskij Vremennik*, XII (1906), 1 - 118.
- PLANUDES, MAXIMUS. *Planudis epistolae*, edited by M. TREU. Breslau, 1890; reprinted, Amsterdam: A.M. HAKKERT, 1960.
- RAYNALDUS, ODORICUS. *Annales ecclesiastici denuo excusi ab A. Theiner*. Bari - Ducis, 1870.
- RHALLES, G.A., and M. POTLES (eds.). *Σύνταγμα τῶν Θεῶν καὶ Ἱερῶν Κανόνων*, 6 vols. Athens, 1855.

- SHELTEMA, H. I., and N. VAN DER WAL (eds.). *Basilicorum Libri*. LX, Series A. Groningen, 1955.
- SCHOELL, R. and G. KNOLL (eds.). *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, III: *Novellae*. Berlin: Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1963.
- THEOKTISTOS the STUDITE. «La Vie d'Athanase, Patriarche de Constantinople», edited by HIPPOLYTE DELEHAYE in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'école française de Rome*, XVII (1897), 39 - 75.
- ZEPOS, J., and P. ZEPOS. *Jus Graccoromanum*, 8 vols. Athens: GEORGE FEXIS, 1931.

LITERATURE

- AHRWEILLER, HÉLÈNE. «L'histoire et la géographie de la région de Smyrne entre les deux occupations turques (1081 - 1317), particulièrement au XIII^e siècle», in *Travaux et Mémoires*, I. Paris: Editions E. DE BOCCARD, 1965, 1 - 204.
- Al Montada*, VII (1973), 5.
- ANDRÉADÈS, A. «Byzance, paradis du monopole et du privilège», *Byzantion*, IX (1934), 171 - 181.
- . «De la population de Constantinople sous les empereurs byzantins», *Metron*, I (1920), 68 - 119.
 - . «Les Juifs et le Fisc dans l'Empire byzantine», in *Mélanges Charles Diehl*, I. Paris: E. LEROUX, 1930, 7 - 29.
 - . «La population de l'empire byzantin», in *Actes du IV^e Congrès International d'Études byzantines*. Sophia: Institut archéologique bulgare, 1935, 117 - 126.
- ANKORI, ZVI. «Greek Orthodox - Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective», *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, XXII (1977), 17 - 57.
- . *Karaites in Byzantium: The Formative Years, 970 - 1100*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- ARNAKIS, GEORGE. *Oi πρώτοι Ὀθωμανοί. Συμβολή εἰς τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς πτώσεως τοῦ ἐλληνισμοῦ τῆς μικρᾶς Ἀσίας: (1282 - 1337)*, in *Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch - neugriechischen Philologie*, XLI (1947), 71 - 130.
- ΑΤΙΥΑ, AZIZ. *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*. New York: Krauss Reprints, 1965.
- BANESCU, NICHOLAS. «Le Patriarche Athanase I et Andronic II Paléologue: État religieux, politique et social de l'Empire», *Académie Roumaine, Bulletin de la Section Historique*, XXIII (1942), 28 - 56.
- BARKER, ERNEST. *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961.
- BECK, HANS - GEORG. *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*, München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959.
- . *Theodoros Metochites, die Krise des Byzantinischen Weltbildes im 14. Jahrhundert*. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1952.
- BEEES, NIKOS A. «Ἰωσήφ Καλοθέτης καὶ ἀναγραφή ἔργων αὐτοῦ», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XVII (1908), 86 - 91.

- BINON, STEPHANE. «L'histoire et la légende de deux chrysobulles d'Andronic II en faveur de Monembasie», *Échos d'Orient*, XXXVII (1938), 274 - 311.
- . *Les origines légendaires et l'histoire de Xéropotamou et de Saint-Paul de l'Athos*, (Bibliothèque du Muséon, 13). Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon, 1942.
- BOMPAIRE, J. «Sur trois termes de fiscalité byzantine», *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, LXXX (1956), 625 - 631.
- BRATIANTU, G.I. «L'approvisionnement de Constantinople sous les Paléologues et les empereurs ottomans», *Byzantion*, VI (1931), 641 - 656.
- . «Notes sur le projet de mariage entre l'empereur Michel IX Paléologue et Catherine de Countenay, 1288 - 1295», *Revue historique du sud-est Européen*, I (1924), 59 - 63.
- . «La question de l'approvisionnement de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine et ottomane», *Byzantion*, V (1930), 83 - 107.
- . *Recherches sur le commerce génois dans la Mer noire au XIII^e siècle*. Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1929.
- BRÉHIER, LOUIS. «Andronic II», *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, II. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1914, cols. 1782 - 1792.
- . *L'église et l'orient au moyen-âge: les croisades*. (Paris: 1928.
- . *Études byzantine d'histoire économique et sociale*. Paris: 1938.
- . «Hiéreus et Basileus», in. *Memorial Louis Petit*. (Archives de l'Orient chrétien, 1). Bucarest: Institut français des Études byzantines, 1948, 41 - 45.
- . *Le monde byzantin*. II: *Les institutions de l'empire byzantine*. Paris: Éditions ALBIN MICHEL, 1970.
- . «Le recrutement des patriarches de Constantinople», in *Actes du VI^e Congrès International d'Études byzantines*, Paris: Éditions Universitaires, 221 - 228.
- BROWN, PETER. «A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy», *The English Historical Review*, CCCXLVI (1973), 1 - 34.
- BUCHON, J.A.C. *Nouvelles recherches historiques sur la principauté française de Morée et ses hautes baronnies*, I. Paris. 1838.
- CARO, GEORGE. «Zur Chronologie der drei letzten Bűrder des Pachymeres», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, VI (1897), 114 - 125.
- «Catalogus Codicum Hagiographicorum Graecorum Bibliothecae Barberiniana de Urbe», *Analecta Bollandiana*, XIX (1900), 81 - 118.
- CHAPMAN, CONRAD. *Michel Paléologue: Restaurateur de l'Empire byzantin*. Paris: EUGÈNE FIGUIÈRE, 1926.
- CHARANIS, PETER. «The Aristocracy of Byzantium in the Thirteenth Century», in *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson*. Edited by P.R. COLEMAN - NORTON, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951, 336 - 355.
- . «Economic Factors in the Decline of the Byzantine Empire», *Journal of Economic History*, XIII (1953), 412 - 424.
- . «Internal Strife in Byzantium during the Fourteenth Century», *Byzantion*, XV (1940 - 1941), 208 - 230.
- . «The Jews in the Byzantine Empire under the First Paleologi», *Speculum*, XXII (1947), 75 - 77.

- . «Monastic Properties and the State in the Byzantine Empire», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, IV (1948), 51 - 117.
 - . «A Note on the Population and Cities of the Byzantine Empire in the Thirteenth Century», in *The Joshua Starr Memorial Volume*. (Jewish Social Studies, 5). New York: Conference on Jewish Relations, 1953, 135 - 148.
 - . «Observations on the Demography of the Byzantine Empire», in *Acts of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies*. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.
 - . «On the Social Structure and Economic Organization of the Byzantine Empire in the Thirteenth Century and Later», *Byzantinoslavica*, XII (1951), 94 - 153.
- CONSTANTELOS, DEMETRIOS. *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1968.
- . «Emperor John Vatatzes' Social Concern: Basis for Canonization», *Kleronomia*. IV (1972), 92 - 104.
 - . «Greek Orthodox - Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective», *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, XXII (1977), 6 - 16.
 - . «Life and Social Welfare Activity of Patriarch Athanasios I of Constantinople», *Theologia*, XLI (1975), 611 - 625.
 - . «Mysticism and Social Involvement in the Later Byzantine Church. Theoleptos of Philadelphia: A Case Study», *Byzantine Studies/Études Byzantines*. VI, (1979), 49 - 60.
- CONSTANTINIDI - BIBIKOU, HÉLÈNE, «Documents concernant l'histoire byzantine, déposés aux Archives Nationales de France», *Mélanges offerts à Octave et Melpo Merlier*, I. Athens: Institut français d'Athènes, 1956, 119 - 132.
- . «Yolande de Montferrat, Impératrice de Byzance», *Hellénisme contemporain*, 2d series, IV (1950), 425 - 442.
- DADE, ERWIN. *Versuche zur Wiederrichtung der latinischen Herrschaft in Konstantinopel im Rahmen der abendländischen Politik* (Jena, 1938).
- DALLEGGIO D'ALESSIO, E. «Les établissements dominicains de Péra (Galata)», *Échos d'Orient*, XXXIX (1936), 83 - 86.
- . «Recherches sur l'histoire de la Latinité de Constantinople. Nomenclature des églises latines de Constantinople sous les empereurs byzantins», *Échos d'Orient*, XXVII (1924), 448 - 460.
- DARROUZÈS, JEAN. «Listes synodales et notitæ», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XXVIII (1970), 57 - 96.
- . *Recherches sur les 'Οφφύα de l'Église byzantine*. (Archives de l'Orient chrétien, 11). Paris: Institut français des Études byzantines, 1970.
- DE MURALT, EDOUARD. *Essai de Chronographie byzantine (1057 - 1453)*. Paris: Librairie «orient» Édition, 1965.
- DIEHL, CHARLES. *History of the Byzantine Empire*. Translated by GEORGE IVES. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1925, at 151 - 176.
- . «De quelques croyances byzantines sur la fin de Constantinople», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXX (1930), 192 - 196.
- DÖLGER, FRANZ, AND J. KARAYANOPOULOS. *Byzantinische Urkundenlehr. I: Die Kaiserurkunden*. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlag, 1968.

- DÖLGER, FRANZ. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des ötrömischen Reichs*, IV. Berlin: C.H. Beck'sche Verlag, 1960.
- DOMDAINE, ANTOINE. «Contra Graecos' premiers écrits polémiques des Dominicains d'orient», *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XXI (1951), 320 - 446.
- ΔΟΥΚΑΚΗΣ, Κ. *Μέγας συναξαριστής πάντων τῶν ἁγίων τῶν καθ' ἅπαντα τὸν μῆνα Ὀκτώβριον ἐορταζομένων*. Athens, 1895, 455.
- DVORNIK, FRANCIS. *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy*. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Press, 1966.
- . *Le Schisme de Photius*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1950.
- EHRHARD, ALBERT. *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, V. Freiburg: Herder, 1930 - 1938.
- . *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche*, XXX. Berlin: Akademie - Verlag, 1952.
- EVERY, GEORGE. *The Byzantine Patriarchate 451 - 1204*, London: SPCK, 1962.
- FINLAY, GEORGE. *A History of Greece*, III. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1877.
- FISHER, ELIZABETH. «A Note on Pachymeres' 'De Andronico Palaeologo'», *Byzantion*, XL (1971), 230 - 235.
- FLOROVSKY, GEORGE. «Antinomies of Christian History: Empire and Desert», in *Christianity and Culture*, II. Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland, 1974, 67 - 100.
- . «The Social Problem in the Eastern Orthodox Church», in *Christianity and Culture*, II. Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland, 1974, 131 - 142.
- FRANCÉS, E. «La féodalité byzantine et la conquête turque», *Studia et Acta Orientalia*, IV (1962), 69 - 90.
- . «La féodalité et les villes byzantines aux XIIIe et au XIVe siècle», *Byzantinoslavica*, XVI (1955), 76 - 96.
- FRAZEE, CHARLES. «The Christian Church in Cilician Armenia: Its Relations with Rome and Constantinople to 1198», *Church History*, XLV (1976) 166 - 184.
- GALANTÉ, G. *Les Juifs de Constantinople sous Byzance*. Istanbul: Imprimerie Babok, 1940.
- ΓΕΑΝΑΚΟΠΟΛΟΣ, ΔΕΝΟ. *Byzantine East and Latin West*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966.
- . *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- ΓΕΝΝΑΔΙΟΣ (ΑΡΑΜΒΑΤΖΟΓΛΟΥ), ΜΕΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΑΝ ΟΦ ΗΛΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ. *Ἱστορία τοῦ Ὀικουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχεῖου*, I. Athens, n.p., 1953.
- . «Ἡ πρώτη ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου ἀποχώρησις τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἀθανασίου Α'» *Orthodoxia*, XXVIII (1953), 145 - 150.
- GIBBONS, HENRY A. *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire*. London: Frank Cass and Co., 1968.
- GILL, JOSEPH. «Emperor Andronicus II and the Patriarch Athanasius I», *Byzantina*, II (1970), 11 - 20.
- GRABER, ANDRE. «Pseudo-Codinus et les cérémonies de la cour byzantine au XIVe siècle», in *Art et Société à Byzance sous les Paléologues*. Venice: Bibliothéque de l'Institut hellénique d'Études byzantines et post-byzantines de Venise, 1971, 193 - 221.

- GRUMEL, V. «La date de l'avènement du patriarche de Constantinople Niphon 1er», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XIII (1955), 138 - 139.
- . «Les mois de Marie des Byzantins», *Échos d'Orient*, XXXI (1932), 257 - 269.
 - . *Traité d'Études byzantines. I: La Chronologie*; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958.
- GUILLAND, RODOLPHE. «La Correspondance inédite d'Athanase, Patriarche de Constantinople (1289 - 1293; 1304 - 1310)», in *Mélanges Charles Diehl*, I. Paris: E. LEROUX, 1930, 121 - 140.
- . *Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1926.
 - . «Les poésies inédites de Theodore Metochite», *Byzantion*, III (1926), 264 - 302.
- HAJJAR, JOSEPH. *Le Synode permanent dans l'Église byzantine des origines au XIe siècle*. (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 164). Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1962.
- HALKIN, FRANÇOIS. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, I. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1957.
- . «L'hagiographie byzantine au service de l'histoire», in *Acts of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies*. London: Oxford University Press, 1967, 345 - 354.
- HAUSHERR, I. «La method d'oraison hésychaste», *Orientalia Christiana*, IX (1927), 77 - 94.
- HEISENBERG, A. *Aus der Geschichte und Literatur der Palaiologenzeit*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1920.
- HERBUT, J. *De ieiunio et abstinentia in Ecclesia byzantina ab initiis usque ad saec. XI*. Rome: Corona Lateranensis, 1968.
- HERMAN, EMILIO. «Recherche sulle istituzioni monastiche byzantine: Typica kletorika, caristicari e monasteri 'liberi'», *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, VI (1940), 203 - 275.
- HEYD, W. *Histoire du Commerce du Levant au moyen-âge*, I. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1959.
- HUART, CLEMENT. «Les origines de l'empire ottoman», *Journal des Savants*, XV (1917), 155 - 166.
- IORGA, N. «Ramon Muntaner et l'empire byzantin», in *Contributions catalans à l'Histoire byzantine*. Paris: Librairie J. Gamber, 1927, 9 - 39.
- IZEDDIN, M. «Un texte arabe sur Constantinople byzantine», *Journal Asiatique*, CCXLVI (1958), 453 - 457.
- JACOBY, DAVID. «La population de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine», *Byzantion*, XXX (1961), 81 - 109.
- . «Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine», *Byzantion*, XXXVI (1967), 167 - 227.
- JANIN, RAYMOND. «Athanase 1er», *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastique*, IV. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1925, cols. 1379 - 1381.
- . *Constantinople byzantine: Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*. Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1964.
 - . «La Bithynie sous l'empire byzantine (1071 - 1337)», *Échos d'Orient*, XX (1921), 301 - 319.

- . «Formation du patriarcat oecuménique de Constantinople», *Échos d'Orient*, XIII (1910), 135 - 140, 213 - 219.
 - . *La Géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin*. II: *Les églises et les monastères*. Paris: Centre national de la Recherche scientifique, 1953.
 - . «Le palais patriarcal de Constantinople», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XX (1962), 131 - 155.
 - . «Les sanctuaires des colonies latines à Constantinople», *Revue des Études byzantines*, IV (1946), 163 - 177.
- JOMBART, E. «Cohabitation», *Dictionnaire de Droit canonique*. III. Paris: Le-touzey et Ané, 1942, 970 - 982.
- JUGIE, MARTIN. «Les origins de la méthode des hésychastes», *Échos d'Orient*, XXX (1931), 179 - 185.
- KRUMBACHER, KARL. *Handbuch der Byzantinischen Literatur*. Berlin, 1897.
- LAIYOU, ANGELIKI. «A Byzantine Prince Latinized: Theodore Palaeologus, Marquis of Montferrat», *Byzantion*, XXXVIII (1968), 386 - 410.
- . *Constantinople and the Latins: The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.
 - . «The Provisioning of Constantinople during the Winter of 1306 - 1307» *Byzantion* XXXVII (1967) 91 - 113.
- LAIYOU - THOMADAKIS, ANGELIKI. *Peasant Society in the Late Byzantine Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- LANGER, WILLIAM, and Robert Blake. «The Rise of the Ottoman Turks», *American Historical Review*, XXXVII (1932), 468 - 505.
- LAURENT, VITALIEN. «Le basilicon: Nouveau nom de moninie sous Andronic II Paléologue», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XLV (1952), 50 - 58.
- . «La chronologie des higoumènes de Lavra de 1283 à 1309», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XXVIII (1970), 97 - 110.
 - . «La chronologie des patriarches de Constantinople au XIIIe siècle», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XXVII (1969), 129 - 149.
 - . «La chronologie des patriarches de Constantinople de la première du XIVe siècle», *Revue des Études byzantines*, VIII (1950), 145 - 155.
 - . «Les crises religieuses à Byzance», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XVIII (1960), 45 - 54.
 - . «La date de la mort de Jean Beccos», *Échos d'Orient*, XXV (1926), 316 - 319.
 - . «Deux nouveaux manuscrits de l'Histoire Byzantine' de Georges Pachymeres», *Byzantion*, XI (1936), 43 - 57.
 - . «La direction spirituelle à Byzance: la correspondance d'Irene - Eulogie Choumnaina Paléologine avec son second directeur», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XIV (1956), 48 - 86.
 - . «Les grandes crises religieuses à Byzance: la fin du schisme arsenite», *Académie Roumaine, Bulletin de la Section historique*, XXVI, part 2 (1945), 225 - 313.
 - . «Grégoire X et le projet d'une ligue antiturque», *Échos d'Orient*, XXXVII (1938), 257 - 273.
 - . «L'idée de guerre sainte et la tradition byzantine», *Revue historique du sud-est européen*, XXIII (1946), 71 - 98.

- . «La liste épiscopale du synodikon de la métropole de Lacédémone», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XIX (1961), 208 - 226.
- . «Notes de chronologie et d'histoire byzantine de la fin du XIII^e siècle», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XXVII (1969), 209 - 234.
- . «Le patriarche d'Antioche Cyrille II (12870c. 1308)», *Analecta Bollandiana*, LXVIII (1950), 310 - 317.
- . «Une princesse byzantine au choitre», *Échos d'Orient*, XXIX (1930), 29 - 60.
- . (ed.). *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, I, fasc. 1. Paris: Institut français d'Études byzantines, 1971.
- . «Les signataires du second synod des Blakhernes», *Échos d'Orient*, XXVI (1927), 129 - 149.
- . «Un théologien unioniste de la fin du XIII^e siècle: le métropolitain d'Adrianople Théoctiste», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XI (1953), 187 - 196.
- LEMERLE, PAUL. «Un chrysobulle d'Andronic II Paléologue pour le monastère de Karakala», *Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique*, LX (1936), 428 - 446.
- . *L'Émirat d'Aydin: Byzance et l'Occident*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957.
- . «Esquisse pour une histoire agraire de Byzance: les sources et les problèmes», *Revue Historique*, CCXIX (1935), 32 - 74, 254 - 284.
- . «Le juge général des Grecs et la réforme judiciaire d'Andronic III», in *Memorial Louis Petit*, (Archives de l'Orient chrétien, I.) Bucarest: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1948, 292 - 316.
- . «Recherches sur les institutions judiciaires à l'époque des Paléologues. II: Le tribunal du patriarcat ou tribunal synodal», *Analecta Bollandiana*, LXVIII (1950), 318 - 333.
- LOENERTZ, RAYMOND. «Le chancelier impérial à Byzance au XIII^e et au XIV^e siècle», *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, XXVI (1960), 275 - 300.
- . «Notes d'histoire et de chronologie byzantine», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XX (1962), 171 - 180.
- MARINESCU, C. «Tentatives de mariage de deux fils d'Andronic II Paleologue avec des princesses latines», *Revue historique du sud-est européen*, I (1924), 139 - 143.
- MATSCHKE, KLAUS - PÖTER. «Politik und Kirche im spätbyzantinischen Reich: Athanasios I, Patriarch von Konstantinopel (1289 - 1293; 1303 - 1309)», *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig. Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, XV (1966), 479 - 486.
- MEYENDORFF, JOHN. «Les débuts de la controverse hésychaste», *Byzantion*, XXIII (1953), 87 - 120.
- . «L'hésychasme: problèmes de sémantique», in *Mélanges d'Histoire des Religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974, 543 - 547.
- . *Introduction à l'Étude de Grégoire Palamas*. Paris: Edition du Seuil, 1959.
- . «Society and Culture in the Fourteenth Century Religious Problems», in *Actes du XIV^e Congrès International des Etudes byzantines*. Bucarest; Éditions de l'Académie de la République Socialiste Roumaine, 1971, 41 - 65.

- . «Spiritual Trends in Byzantium in the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries», in *Art et Société à Byzance sous les Paléologues*. Venice: Bibliothèque de l'Institut hellénique d'Études byzantines et post-byzantines de Venise, 1971, 53 - 71.
- MEYER, P. *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster*. Amsterdam: A.M. HAKKERT, 1965. (Reprint of 1894 edition).
- MICHEL, ANTON. *Die Kaisermacht in der Ostkirche (843 - 1204)*. Darmstadt: HERMANN GENTNER VERLAG, 1959.
- MILLER, WILLIAM. *The Latins in the Levant*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1964.
- MORANVILLE, H. «Les projets de Charles de Valois sur l'empire de Constantinople», *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, II (1890), 63 - 86.
- NASRALLAH, J. «Chronologies des patriarches melkites d'Antioche de 1250 à 1500», *Proche - Orient Chrétien*, XVII (1967), 192 - 229.
- NICOL, DONALD. *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261 - 1413*. New York: St. Martin Press, 1972.
- . «Mixed Marriages in Byzantium in the Thirteenth Century», in C.W. DUGMORE and CHARLES DUGGAN. *Studies in Church History*, Vol. I. London: Nelson, 1964.
- OMONT, H. «Projet de réunion des Églises greque et latine sous Charles le Bel en 1327», *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, LIII (1892), 254 - 257.
- ONATIBIA, I. «Torres», *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, XIV (1967), cols. 206 - 207.
- OSTROGORSKY, GEORGE. *History of the Byzantine State*. Translated by J. Hussey, New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1969.
- . «The Palaeologi», in *Cambridge Medieval History*, IV, part 1. Edited by J. HUSSEY. Cambridge: University Press, 1966.
- . «Pour l'histoire de l'immunité à Byzance», *Byzantion*, XXVIII (1958), 165 - 254.
- PAPADAKIS, ARISTEIDES. «Late Thirteenth Century Byzantine Theology and Gregory II of Cyprus», in *Byzantine Ecclesiastical Personalities*. Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Press, 1975, 57 - 72.
- PAPADOPULOS, AVERKIOS. *Versuch einer Genealogie der Palaiologen (1259 - 1453)*. Amsterdam: Verlag ADOLF M. HAKKERT, 1962.
- PAPADOPULOS - KERAMEUS, A. «Νικηφόρος Μοσχόπουλος» *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XII (1903), 215 - 223.
- PARGOIRE, J. «Constantinople: Le couvent de l'Evergétés», *Échos d'Orient*, IX (1906), 228 - 232.
- . «Les monastères doubles chez les Byzantins», *Échos d'Orient*, IX (1906), 21 - 25.
- PETIT, LOUIS. «La réforme judiciaire d'Andronic Paléologue», *Échos d'Orient*, IX (1906), 134 - 138.
- PIERRE, HIÉROMOINE, «Notes d'ecclésiologie orthodoxe», *Irénikon*, X (1933), 111 - 139.
- POSSINE, PETER. «Chronologia», in Pachymeres, *De Andronico Palaeologo*, II. («Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae»). Bonn, 1835, 835 - 870.
- RAYBAUD, LEON - PIERRE. *Le Gouvernement et l'administration central de l'empire byzantin sous les premiers Paléologues*. Paris: Sirey, 1968.

- ROUILLARD, GERMAINE. «Les archives de Lavra», *Byzantion*, III (1926), 253 - 264.
- . «Le politique de Michel VIII Paléologue à l'égard des monastères», *Revue des Études byzantines*, I (1943), 73 - 84.
 - . «Recensements de terres sous les premiers Paléologues», *Byzantion*, XII (1937), 105 - 118.
 - . *La vie rural dans l'empire byzantin*. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, 1953.
- RUBIO Y LLUCH, ANTONI. *Diplomatari de l'Orient Catala (1301 - 1409)*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1947.
- . *Paquimères y Muntaner*, «Mémoires de la secció històrico-arqueologica del Institut d'Estudis Catalans, I». Barcelona, 1927.
- RUNCIMAN, STEVEN. *A History of the Crusades*, III. New York: Harper Torch-books 1967.
- SALAVILLE, S. «Après le schisme arsénite: le correspondance inédite du Pseudo-Jean Chilas», *Académie Roumaine, Bulletin de la Section historique*, XXV (1944), 174 - 193.
- . «Deux documents inédit sur les dissensions religieuse byzantine entre 1275 et 1310», *Revue des Études Byzantines*, V (1947), 111 - 130.
 - . «Un directeur spirituel à Byzance au debut du XIVE siècle: Théolepte de Philadelphie», in *Mélange Joseph de Ghellinck*, II. Gembloux: Éditions J. DUCLOT, 1951, 877 - 887.
 - . «Formes ou méthodes de prière d'après un Byzantin de XIVE siècle, Théolepte de Philadelphie», *Échos d'Orient*, XXXIX (1940), 1 - 25.
 - . «Le titre ecclésiastique de 'proedros' dans les documents byzantins», *Échos d'Orient*, XXIX (1930), 417 - 434.
 - . «La vie monastique greque au début du XIVE siècle», *Revue des Études byzantines*, II (1944), 119 - 125.
- SCHLUMBERGER, G. *Expéditions des «Almugavares» ou routiers Catalans en Orient*. Paris: n.p., 1902.
- SCHMID, PIA. «Zur Chronologie von Pachymeres, Andronikos L. II - III», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LI (1950), 82 - 86.
- ŠEVČENKO, IHOR. *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos*. Brussels: Édition de Byzantion, 1962.
- . «The imprisonment of Manuel Moschopoulos in the year 1305 or 1306», *Speculum*, XXVII (1952), 133 - 157.
 - . «Léon Bardales et les juges généraux, ou la corruption des incorruptibles», *Byzantion*, XIX (1949), 247 - 249.
 - . «Nicolas Cabasilas' 'Anti-Zealot' Discourse: A Reinterpretation», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XI (1957), 79 - 171.
 - . «Society and Intellectual Life in the Fourteenth Century», in *Actes du XIVE Congrès International d'Études byzantines*. Bucarest: Éditions de l'Académie de la République Socialiste Roumaine, 1971, 7 - 30.
 - . «Le sens et la date du traité Anepigraphos' de Nicéphore», *Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques. Académie royale de Belgique*, XXXV (1949), 473 - 488.
- SHARF, ANDREW. *Byzantine Jewry from Justinian to the Fourth Crusade*. London: ROUTLEDGE AND KEGAN PAUL, 1971,

- STARR, JOSHUA. *Romania. The Jewries of the Levant after the 4th Crusade*. Paris: Éditions du Centre, 1949, especially 25 - 35.
- . *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 641-1204*. Athens: Byzantinische - Neugriechische, 1939.
- STEIN, ERNEST. «Introduction à l'histoire et aux institutions byzantines», *Traditio*, VII (1949 - 1951), 95 - 168.
- STEPHANUS - HILPISCH, P. «Die Doppelkloster: Entstehung und Organisation», *Beiträge zur Geschichte des alter Monchtums und des Benediktinerordens*, Heft 15. Munster: n.p. 1928.
- STIERNON, D. «Le quartier du Xérolophos à Constantinople et les reliques vénitiennes de Saint Athanasos», *Revue des Études byzantines*, XIX (1961), 165 - 188.
- SYKOUTRES, JOHN. «Ἐπεὶ τὸ σῆμα τῶν Ἀρσενιατῶν», *Hellenika*, II (1929), 267 - 332; III (1930), 15 - 44.
- TALBOT, ALICE-MARY. «The Patriarch Athanasius and the Church», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XXVII (1973), 7 - 33.
- TATAKIS, BASIS. *La philosophie byzantine*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1959.
- TELLENBACH, G. *Church, State, and Christian Society*. Translated by R.F. BENNETT. Oxford: BASIL BLACKWELL, 1966.
- TREU, MAXIMUS. *Matthaios, Metropolit von Ephesos: Über sein Leben und sein Schriften*. Potsdam: A.M. HAKKERT, 1901.
- TRIANANTHYLLOPOULOS, K. «Die Novelle des Patriarchen Athanasius über die 'Trimoiria'», *Byzantinische Neugriechische Jahrbücher*, VIII (1931), 136-146.
- UNDERWOOD, PAUL A. *The Kariye Djami*, I. New York: Pantheon, 1966.
- VAILHÉ, SIMÉON. «Le droit d'appel en orient et le synod permanent de Constantinople», *Échos d'Orient*, XXIV (1921), 129 - 146.
- VASILIEV, A.A. *History of the Byzantine Empire*. Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958.
- VERPEAUX, J. *Nicéphore Choumnos*. Paris: Edition A. et J. PICARD, 1959.
- . «Notes chronologiques sur les livres II et III du Andronico Paleologo de Georges Pachymère», *Revue des Études byzantine*, XXVII (1959), 168-173.
- VRYONIS, SPEROS. *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971.
- . «Byzantium: The Social Basis of Decline in the Eleventh Century», *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, II (1959), 159 - 175.
- WARE, KALLISTOS, «The Jesus Prayer in St. Gregory of Sinai», *Eastern Churches Review*, IV (1970), 3 - 22.
- WITTEK, P. «Deux chapitres de l'histoire des turks de Roum», *Byzantion*, XI (1936), 285 - 297.
- . *Das Fürstentum Mentesch Studien zur Geschuchte Westkleinasiens im 13. - 14. Jahrhundert*. Istanbul: Abteilung Istanbul des archäologischen Institutes des Deutschen Reiches, 1934.
- ZACHARIAE VON LINGENTHAL, Karl E. *Geschichte des griechisch - römischen Rechts*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1892.
- ZAKYTHINOS, D.A. *Crise monétaire et crise économique à Byzance du XIIIe au XVe siècles*. Athens: L'Hellénisme contemporain, 1948.
- ZHISHMAN, J. *Das Eherecht der orientalischen Kirche*. Vienna: WILHELM BRAU-MÜLLER, 1864.

INDEX

A

Adam, Guillaume, 114, 193
 Adramyttion, 17
 akoulouthiai, 32
akritai, 91
 Alexandria, Patriarch of, 29
 Al-Gezari, 207 - 208
 Amaseia, 115
 Andronicos, 13
 support of reforms, 48, 84-87
 Anatolia, 91-96, 113, 116, 169
 Ann of Hungary, 188-189
apographieis, 150
 Armenians, 117, 205-210
 Arsenites, 16-17, 30, 42, 45, 59,
 89, 117, 139-148
 Arsenite Schism, 140
 Arsenias, Patriarch, 13, 116,
 139, 142, 145
 Athanasius, 168
 ἄ-ἀκτως, 168
 Athanasius, his life, 39-43
 apologia, 18
 ecclesiology, 62-70
 election, 18
 letters, 33-37
 patriarchate, first, 43-50
 patriarchate, second, 56-62
 resignation, first, 50-54
 resignation, second, 87-90
 social reforms, 70-74
 vitae, 31-32, 33, 42, 43, 88, 166,
 Athanasius II of Alexandria
 57-58, 100, 125-126
 Athos, Mount, 170-172
auctoritas, 67

B

Balsamon, 95

Banescu 22, 36
 Bapheus, Battle of, 93, 156
 baptism, teaching on, 137-138
 Basil the Great, 164
basileia, 60-62, 66-67
 Beck, H.G., 25
 Benefices, 100
 Benjamin of Tudel, 205
 Bishops 47, 58, 60, 93, 95-100,
 120-123
 corruption, 102-104
 residence, 110-112, 120
 Bithynia, 93-95
 Blachernae, Council of, 184
 Bompaire, Jacques, 151
Book of Prefect, 204
 Botaniates, Nicephoros 111, 81
 Bréhier, Louis, 21, 149, 192
 Brown, Peter, 180

C

Cabasilas, Nicholas, 46
 Callistus, 21
 Caltabellota, Treaty of, 197
Catalan Chronicles, 33
 Catalan Company, 73, 117-118,
 197 - 202
 Catherine of Courtenay, 189,
 192
cenobia, 176
 Chalcedon, Metropolitan of, 120
Chalke 66, 32
 Charanis, 151, 207
 Charles of Valois, 189, 194
 Chora, Monastery of, 45, 86
 Choumos Nicephoras, 46, 48,
 72, 87-88, 156
 Clement V, 192
 Clergy, 82, 136

Clergy; general instruction,
134-138
Clergy of St. Sophia, 101-102,
128-132
Comnenos, Alexios I, 82
Constantine, 50
Constantinople, 13, 87,
conversions, 112-119
Correspondances, 36
Cosmidion, Monastery of, 45, 86
Council of Lyons, 15
Cyril, Patriarch of Antioch,
99, 125, 127-128

D

David, 103
De Andronico Palaeologo, 28
defensores civitatis, 118
Delehaye, Hipolyte, 32
didaskalia, 170
Diehl, Charles, 18
Dominicans, 187, 188
Dripys, John, 109

E

Ecclesiastical reforms, 47
ἐξουουσία, 133, 151
ἐλίγχοϛ, 88
ἐνδημοῦντεϛ, 105
Episcopal corruption, 102-104
Episcopal corruption, 102-104
Episcopal residence, 47-48,
110-112
epistemonarches, 66-67, 112
ἐργαστήριον, 83
Eosphigmenou, Monastery of, 40

F

Fasting, 82-84
filioque 41-42, 184-185
Fisc 71 78
Florobsky, Georges, 164
Franciscans 187
Φρερίτοι, 187

G

Galata, Genoesc, 60, 150
Galicia. 98
Galisios, 41-42
Ganos, 42
Gennadios, 49
Genoa, 186, 100
ghazi, 113
grain commision, 203-205
Gregoras, nicephoras, 21-22, 28,
30-31, 34, 36, 44-45, 47-49,
54, 124, 220-221
Grand Diocete, 108
Gregory VII, Pope, 68
Gregory of Cyprus, 17, 21, 42,
131
Gregory of Sinai, 161
Guiland Rodolphe, 36

H

haradj, 113
Hesychasm 46 160-162
hetaeriarch 72
hierosyne 62-64, 66
Hilarion of Peribleptos, 169
Hilarion of Selimbria, 55
holy war, 168-169
Hosea (propriat), 103
hypotyposis, 173-179

I

imperium, 62-63, 74
Irene (Choumnos), 72, 190
Ishmael, 64
Islam, 112-117, 168

J

Jeremiah, (prophet), 23
Jews, 182-183, 205-210
John IV Lascaris, 15
John XII, 16, 41-42, 184-185
John Beccos, 41, 42, 184-185
John Chilas, 18, 143
John Chrysostom 25

Joseph, Patriarch, 13, 16,
Joseph Kalothetos, 32-33
Josephites, 16
jurisdictio, 52
Justinian 75, 129, 165

K

κατ' ἐπίδοσιν,
Kalothetos, Joseph, 32-33, 38,
41, 45, 48, 53
Khasarie, Khan of, 115
Krumbacher, Karl, 30

L

Lacou, Angeliki, 36, 216
Lascarid, 16, 91
λατινόφρονες 193
Latin Christianity, 183, 188
Latins, 117-118, 181, 183-195
Laurent, 18, 34, 51, 57, 75, 170,
177 209
Lavra, 170-171, 179
Lazarus, Monastery of, 40
Lemerle, Paul, 106
Leo VI, Emperor, 77, 82
Lependrenos, Athanasios, 40
Lithuania, 98
Lull, Raymond, 192

M

marriage regulations, 80-82, 136
Matschke, Klaus-Peter, 70
Maximos, abbot, 171
Maximos the Confessor 142
megadoux, 196
μεγαλόσχημος, 40
Metaxopoulos, Athanasius, 171
Metochites, Theodore, 48
Meyendorf, John, 16, 21, 40, 161
Micah, 103
Michael VIII, 15-16, 42, 182
Michael IX, 93, 189-190, 197
198, 211
Miller, William, 19
Mogavares, (see Catalans)

Mongols, 91
Monks, 60
monasteries, double, 165-167
monasticism, 45-48
decadence, 162-165
mobility, 167-170
property, 154-160
regulations, 172-179
wealth, 149-153
morality, 23
moral life, 119-123
Moranville, 194
Moschopoulos, Nicephoras, 99
Mosele, Monastery of, 141, 145
Muslims, 211-212
Mutaner, Ramon, 31, 195, 201

N

Negara, 76-86, 108, 111, 170
Neilos, Patriarch, 42, 168
Nicaea II, 167-168
Ninevites, 24
Niphon, Patriarch, 88-89, 146-
147
non-Orthodox population, 181-
213
N (cont.)
Notitia Episcopatum, 98, 119
Nymphaeum, Treaty of, 186

O

ordination, 135-136
ordo, 52
Osman, 92
Osmanlis, 92-93, 112, 113

P

Pachymeres, 20-21, 28, 30-31,
34, 35, 101
Palaeologans, 16, 92
Palamas, Gregory, 160-162
Panion, Bishop of, 108
Περπαδopoulos - Kerameus, A.,
31
paroikos, 77

Pera-Galata, 187
philanthropia, 77
 Philip I of Courtenay, 189
 Philip IV, 192
 Philotheos, 21, 160
 Planudes, ἄξιμος, 207
 πολυάνθρωπα, 94
praktika, 150
praxis, 161
 priesthood, 40
proedros, 97, 100, 116
 Promissory Letter, 60-61
pronoiai, 158-159
protos, 154, 165

R

reconquista, 186
 reforms, general, 20-27, 45
 refugees 72-75, 197, 201
Regestes, 35
 repentance, 24
 Rita: Maria, 211
 Roger de Flor, 31, 117, 195-200

S

Sabbas, monk, 46-47, 50
sacerdotium, 62-63, 74
 Salaville, S., 97
 Salviati, Cardinal of, 40
 Sardis, Bishop of, 99
 Sardis, Metropolitan of, 121, 125
 sexual abuses, 64, 79-82, 136
 schism, 16, 50, 87
 Scoleces, Menas, 56
 Seljuk Sultanate, 91
 simony, 135
sitokrithon, 199
 S (cont)
 Sodomites, 24
stabilitas loci, 167
stavropegia, 153-154
 Stephanus-Hilpisch, 166
 Svjetoslav, 203
 σχολᾶζων, 96
 Sylaiote, 49
symandron, 115, 212

symphonia, 63
Synodos Endemousa, 74-75, 105
 - 109, 122

T

Talbot, Alice-Mary, 31, 34, 68, 210
 Tarchaniotes, John, 158
 testation, 76-78
 Theoktistos the Studite, 32, 39, 41, 43, 45, 48, 166, 184
 Theoleptos of Philadelphia, 17, 26, 56, 96, 122, 140, 143-145, -163-164
 Theophanes, 89-90
 Theophilos of Alexandria, 126
 θεωρία, 26
 τιμωρία, 146
 Torres, Francisco, 35
 Trent, Council of, 35
 Trianopolis, Bishop of, 124
 Trullo, Council of, 95
 Turks, 30, 73, 89, 92

U

Union of Lyons, 13, 15, 17-18, 41-42, 184-185
 Uros II Milutin, 194

V

Vaticanus Graecus 2219, 34-36, 38, 52, 54, 60, 75, 134
 Venetians, 186-187
 Verpeauxn Jean, 33
 Vicina, Bishop of, 121
 Vryonis, 101 - 102

W

Wittek, P., 93

X

Xerolophos, 42, 52, 54, 57, 59, 89

Xeropotamou, Monastery of
151
Xiphilinus, John VIII, 81

Y

Yolanda (Irene) of Montferrat,
188-189

Z

Zechariah, (prophet),
Zottarello, Domenico,
Zylots, 142, 144